# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 250 JC 850 114

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Cohen, Arthur M.; And Others |
| TITLE | Transfer Education in American Community Colleges. |
| INSTITUTION | Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 9 Apr 85 |
| NOTE | 313p.; Prepared as part of the Ford Foundation's Urban Community Colleges Transfer Opportunities Program. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC13 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Articulation (Education); *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Institutional Characteristics; *Minority Groups; Postsecondary Education; *Transfer Programs; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; Urban Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Urban Community Coll Transfer Opportunities Prog |

ABSTRACT

Stemming from the Ford Foundation's Urban Community Colleges Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP), this report presents the results of efforts of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges to gather and analyze data on the 24 two-year colleges that received UCCTOP grants to advance transfer opportunities in urban, public community colleges. Chapter 1 discusses the state of transfer education in community colleges, particularly as it relates to the enrollment of minority students. Chapter 2 reviews the process of selecting the colleges that received UCCTOP grants. Chapter 3 profiles the UCCTOP colleges, giving particular attention to minority enrollment patterns. Chapter 4 covers the administrative organization and governance of the colleges, and the intersegmental articulation policies in the colleges' states. Chapter 5 offers data on faculty characteristics and attitudes regarding transfer education. In chapter 6, information on student characteristics, predisposition to transfer, characteristics that are predictive of transfer, and student satisfaction with the transfer function at the colleges is presented. Chapter 7 details the projects conducted by the colleges to enhance transfer opportunities for minority students. The last chapter offers recommendations concerning policy, organization, and program content, and considers the future of transfer education. (LAL)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED255250

# Transfer Education in American Community Colleges

**Submitted by:**
Center for the
Study of Community Colleges

**Submitted to:**
The Ford Foundation

**Date Submitted:**
April 9, 1985

JC 850 114

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. M. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN
JOHN LOMBARDI
FLORENCE B. BRAWER

1047 GAYLEY AVENUE, SUITE 205
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
(213) 208-6088

# TRANSFER EDUCATION IN AMERICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the Ford Foundation as part of the Foundation's Urban Community Colleges Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP)

Staff: Arthur M. Cohen
Florence B. Brawer
Estela M. Bensimon

Dates: January 2, 1984 to March 31, 1985

## PREFACE

This report summarizes a project conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges under a grant from the Ford Foundation, Alison Bernstein, Program Officer. The senior project staff included Arthur M. Cohen, Florence B. Brawer, and Estela Bensimon. The project stemmed from the Ford Foundation's long-standing commitment to increasing access to higher education for minority-group students.

In 1983 the Foundation launched a major program of grants specifically intended to advance transfer in urban, public, comprehensive community colleges. The program was unusual in several aspects: the funds appropriated under the umbrella program -- known as UCCTOP -- were targeted to urban community colleges only; the grants to be made were exclusively intended for the purpose of developing strategies to strengthen transfer education; and the program consisted of two distinctive phases, both of which required interinstitutional competition.

The first phase of the program begun in July 1983, when 71 comprehensive urban community colleges in 58 cities were invited to apply for grants of $25,000 each. To be eligible for participation, the colleges had to meet three criteria: (1) they had to be under public control and have a policy of open admissions; (2) their programmatic offerings had to be comprehensive; and (3) minority and low-income students had to represent at least one-third of the total enrollment. These types of colleges were selected because they represent a main point of access to higher education for minorities. Sixty-three of the 71 applied.

In September 1983, after the Foundation convened a panel of national educators to review and evaluate the proposals submitted, 24 were selected as the winners. These 24 colleges completed the first phase of the project in June 1984. Five of them were selected, after an on-site evaluation coordinated by the Academy for Educational Development, to participate in the second phase of the program, scheduled to end in June 1987.

UCCTOP is an umbrella program in that besides including the colleges selected for participation, three other major grants were made. One grant was made to the Academy for Educational Development to coordinate on-site reviews of the first phase; a second grant was made to Networks (Bronx Community College) for the purpose of periodically convening meetings among the 24 colleges; and a third grant was made to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges to gather and analyze data from the twenty-four UCCTOP colleges.

This document presents the data collected and analyzed by the Center during the period covering January 1984 - March 1985. The report is organized into eight chapters.

The first chapter consists of a discussion of the state of transfer education in community colleges, particularly as it relates to the enrollment of minority students.

The second chapter reviews the process of selecting the colleges that received UCCTOP grants.

The third chapter offers a profile of the UCCTOP colleges. Considerable attention is given to minority enrollment patterns as well as changes in enrollment and degress conferred experienced between 1976 and 1982 by the 24 UCCTOP colleges.

Chapter Four covers their administrative and governance organization and intersegmental articulation policies in the UCCTOP college states. It describes organizational difference across the 24 colleges and statewide policies, guidelines, and voluntary agreements governing articulation between the public two-year and four-year college sectors.

The fifth chapter deals with the UCCTOP faculty. Data collected through a survey of a random sample of the faculty teaching transferable courses in the 24 colleges are used to describe important faculty characteristics. Additionally, data are provided to describe faculty attitudes vis-a-vis transfer education.

Chapter Six considers the UCCTOP college students. It is organized into four sections: (1) a general demographic profile of a representative sample of surveyed students from the 24 colleges; (2) amount of student predisposition to transfer to senior colleges; (3) a description and discussion of student characteristics that are predictive of transfer attitudes and transfer behaviors; and (4) a statement regarding student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function.

Chapter Seven details the projects conducted by each of the funded colleges as they attempted to enhance transfer opportunities for their minority students.

The last chapter provides a series of recommendations to strengthen transfer education, organized into three areas: Policy, Organization, and Content. The final section of this chapter considers the future for transfer.

Several individuals provided valuable assistance in various phases of this project. Robert Birnbaum, Kathryn Moore, Dorothy M. Knoell, Steve Sheldon, Anne-Marie McCartan, and R.C. Richardson, Jr. reviewed the faculty questionnaire and made valuable suggestions for revision. Graduate students in UCLA's Higher Education Specialization, who also teach in community colleges, volunteered to review the items and suggest revisions. The student survey was also reviewed by Steve Sheldon and Anne-Marie McCartan.

Two of our colleagues at UCLA -- James Trent and Alexander Astin -- were paricularly helpful in suggesting alternative ways of organizing the data on student predisposition to transfer. Others who reviewed and commented on our preliminary report on student predisposition to transfer were Michael Olivas and Steve Zwerling. Margaret Orr provided excellent guidance in the use of factor analysis to develop the attitudinal and behavioral measures of predisposition to transfer.

Throughout the 15 months of this project, several UCLA graduate students have been involved in a variety of capacities, they were Frank Ayala, Michelle J. Riley, Reed Markham, and Douglas Tataryn. Douglas Tataryn, in particular, was meticulous and highly creative in the methods employed to measure student predisposition to transfer.

The project directors of the 24 UCCTOP colleges, despite their many responsibilities, were always willing to assist in the collection of data, distribution and retrieval of survey instruments, and in responding to our numerous requrests for data and additional information. It goes without saying that were it not for their generous assistance this project could have never come to fruition.

We wish to thank Alison Bernstein who, as our Ford Foundation Program Officer, has been a constant source of support and enthusiastic encouragement. Many of the ideas put forth in this report originated from questions posed and observations made by Alison at various stages of the project. Her insight about community colleges, often provided us with new ideas and new ways of looking and interpreting the data.

Lastly we are grateful to Lesa Kitchen and Glenda Childress for their assistance in typing the report.

The project described herein was designed by Arthur M. Cohen, President of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, and Florence B. Brawer, Research Director at the Center, in consultation with Alison Bernstein, Ford Foundation Program Officer, and Estela Bensimon, who was a consultant to the Ford Foundation. Dr. Bensimon subsequently came to the Center as a full-time staff associate for 15 months to participate in the detailed design and execution of the project. She was responsible primarily for the work described in Chapters Three through Six and for many of the recommendations noted in Chapter Eight. She left the Center in March, 1985, to become Assistant to the President of Montclair State College.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1983 the Ford Foundation awarded $25,000 to each of 24 public, comprehensive, urban community colleges for the purpose of stimulating transfer opportunities for minority students. The Center for the Study of Community Colleges participated in the project to the extent of collecting and analyzing data about the 24 colleges and the process of making the awards. Data sets included a survey of the students and faculty, and information about college administration, governance, and finance, and related college characteristics. In addition Center staff members interviewed the team that selected the grantees and analyzed the reports of the projects that each of the colleges pursued in their efforts to extend transfer opportunities for minority students.

Findings of these data analyses were as follows:

The transfer function in community colleges has recently once again come to the fore as a major institutional activity;

Selection of the colleges to be funded was done with great care but the on-site evaluation of the college projects should have been handled with more attention to interrater reliability;

The ratio of the degrees conferred by the participating colleges was lower than that for colleges in the nation as a whole;

There is great variance between the states in transfer and articulation policies, revealing differences in governmental perceptions of the role of the community colleges;

## Faculty

Faculty demographics in the 24 colleges differ from the national norms in that there are more minority group instructors;

Most instructors do not have information on their student's transfer aspirations, performance on basic skills tests, or employment status;

Few faculty members meet with students informally outside class or posted office hours;

A majority of the instructors base the preponderance of their students' final grade on scores made on objective tests;

Most of the faculty have compared their course syllabi, textbooks, and assignments required with comparable courses in senior institutions;

Less than one instructor in five believes that the primary function of the community college should be to prepare students for transfer;

More than half of the faculty believe that community college students will feel a better sense of accomplishment if they earn a baccalaureate degree;

## Students

More than half the students in the 24 colleges had family incomes of less than $16,000;

Three-fourths of the students aspire to a bachelor's degree or higher;

Over half the students were in college primarily to prepare for transfer;

More than 40% of the students indicated that they were not aware of such college services as academic or career counseling, honors programs, orientation for potential transfer students, or senior colleges applications workshops;

Half the students indicated they had rarely asked instructors for advice and two-thirds of them indicated they rarely made informal conversation with instructors;

Student intentions to transfer and their behavior as measured by their taking part in transfer planning and information gathering activities were at variance;

The students whose transfer oriented behavior was high tended to be the full-time attendees who were younger, most likely to be employed 21-30 hours per week, and aspiring to graduate or professional degrees;

The Asian and white students were highest in both transfer attitudes and behaviors while the black students were lowest in both categories;

## Transfer Opportunities

Most of the college projects to enhance transfer opportunity had to do with student recruitment, transfer institution articulation, and special activities for selected groups of students;

The community colleges would enhance transfer opportunity for their students if they better coordinated their curriculum with both secondary school and university offerings;

The colleges need better data regarding who transfers and where;

Task forces related to transfer might be organized with the attention of fitting curriculum, student support services, and transfer information together;

Colleges need a procedure for identifying and staying in contact with potential transfer students;

Sophomore level courses must be offered even when enrollments are low;

Computerized transfer information systems including senior college requirements related to individual student programs should be developed;

Potential transfer students should be better connected with the college through peer support groups and by providing job opportunities on campus.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE i

Chapter

1 THE TRANSFER FUNCTION AND THE MINORITIES 1

Minorities in Two-Year Colleges 6

2 SELECTING THE GRANTEES 25

3 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UCCTOP COLLEGES 36

Enrollment Patterns in the UCCTOP Colleges 38
Minority Enrollment in the UCCTOP Colleges 42
Degrees Conferred by the UCCTOP Colleges 44
Summary Discussion 51

4 ADMINISTRATIVE AND GOVERNANCE ORGANIZATION 53

Statewide Intersegmental Articulation 57
Provisions in Statewide Intersegmental Articulation Policies, Guidelines, and Voluntary Agreements 61

5 THE FACULTY 71

Sample Selection 73
Sample Characteristics 73
Faculty Awareness of Student Characteristics 78
Faculty Interaction with Students 80
Preparing Students for the Academic Environment of Senior Colleges 83
Faculty Involvement in Transfer-Related Activities 86
Faculty Attitudes Towards the Transfer Function 87
Faculty Attitudes Towards Community College Functions 93
Summary Discussion 95

6 THE STUDENTS 102

Sample Selection 103
Sample Characteristics 105
Educational Background Characteristics 108

Chapter Page

Attendance and Enrollment Status 110
Educational Aspirations and Career Goals 111
Primary Reason for Attending College 114
Primary Reason for Attending College and Student Characteristics 116
Sources of Information on Course Transferability 120
Sources of Information on Transfer Opportunities 121
Student Involvement in the Institutional Environment 122
Student-Faculty Interaction 125
Commitment to Learning 126
Student Predisposition to Transfer 131
Measures of Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors 133
Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors of Potential Transfer Students 138
Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Selected Student Characteristics 140
Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Degree Aspirations 146
Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Reason for Attending College 147
The Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors of Minority Students 148
Predisposition to Transfer and Measures of Student Involvement 155
Predictor Variables of Transfer Predisposition 168
Student Perceptions of Institutional Performance of the Transfer Function 177
Student Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of the Transfer Function and Ethnicity 178
Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Transfer Attitudes/Behaviors 179
Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Sources of Information on Transfer Opportunities 180
Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Participation in Support Services 181
Summary Discussion 184

7 THE COLLEGE PROJECTS 190

8 RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY 252

Transfer Education Policy 252
Transfer Education Organization 256
Content of Transfer Education 263
The Future of Transfer 266

Chapter | Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY 276

Appendix

1 EDUCATION AND GENERAL REVENUES RAW AMOUNTS FOR THE UCCTOP COLLEGES, 1981-82 281

2 EDUCATION AND GENERAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT IN THE UCCTOP COLLEGES, 1981-82 282

3 DOMINANT STRATEGIES SELECTED BY THE UCCTOP COLLEGES TO IMPROVE TRANSFER OPPORTUNITIES 283

4 METHOD USED TO CONSTRUCT ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL TRANSFER MEASURES AND MEASURE OF STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFER FUNCTION 284

5 THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES 290

# CHAPTER ONE:

# THE TRANSFER FUNCTION AND THE MINORITIES

As of 1983 there were 1,219 two-year colleges in America, 1,064 of them under public control. These community colleges accounted for more than one-third of all institutions of higher education and for 37 percent of the total enrollment in colleges and universities. They serve as the point of first entry to higher education for many who would not otherwise be able to attend college; more than one-third of the people beginning college in America begin in a community college. The institutions are an essential component of a democratic system of higher education, one that seeks to acculturate the citizenry and to make opportunity for further education available to all. In this sense the community college has its roots in the idea of the common school, one that would be attended by nearly everyone in the community so that they would develop the shared understandings so necessary for the maintenance of social cohesion.

The two-year colleges offer courses for the student's personal interest and for job upgrading, programs for people seeking entry to the job market and the technology-based professions, basic literary instruction, and courses for those who plan on transferring to senior institutions. This latter, the transfer function, is as old as the colleges themselves which, in most states, began as junior colleges with transfer as a primary mission. These institutions were to enroll the high school graduates seeking entry to college who, for whatever reason, could not matriculate at a four-year college or university.

When the colleges developed between 1910 and 1960, transfer education's success was not in doubt. Most matriculants professed transfer as their main intent, and at least 20 to 30 percent of their students did move on to upper-division studies. But preparation for immediate employment became a major function in the 1940 to 1970 era and that, coupled with the decline in academic ability of students entering the two-year colleges, made successful transfer more the exception than the rule. Furthermore, the drive for higher education exhibited by students from groups formerly underrepresented in college populations led many two-year college leaders to emphasize open entry, as though that were an end in itself.

The issue of transfer has come to the fore only recently. In the 1970s the rhetoric emanating from the community colleges centered on the theme of access: access for all people of any age and for any purpose. More recently, outcomes have become a matter of concern as educators at all levels have realized that attracting students to their institution is only the first part of the task; the people must be provided with an education that reveals itself in their having gained knowledge useful to them as thinking individuals, productive citizens, and members of their community.

One of the questions swirling around transfer as a general theme is the community college's effect on different segments of the population. The colleges enroll many older adults but the median age of community college students is 21 1/2 years; hence, the population is heavily skewed toward people just out of high school who are beginning their college career. Have these matriculants jeopardized their chance to gain the baccalaureate by beginning their career in a community college? The data are incomplete and scanty.

The first problem is that no one knows exactly how many students begin in a community college and eventually transfer. The pattern is confounded by people who transfer after one semester; people who begin at the university, return to the community college for a time, and then transfer to the university once again; people who take courses at a local community college and university branch concurrently; those who start at a community college and stop out for a couple of years before entering the university, and so on. Nationwide, probably fewer than five percent of the students who begin at a community college complete two years there and then transfer immediately to a university. Probably another eight or ten percent begin at a community college and transfer without completing two years or transfer later. But those figures are merely educated guesses based on incomplete data. The figures may seem low but considering the numbers of students enrolled in current interest courses, courses for people who already have degrees, occupational programs, remedial courses, and noncredit educational activities -- all of which are summed together to arrive at the community college enrollment figures typically published -- it is a wonder the figures are as high as they are.

In discussing the transfer function, it is important to define terms. There are at least three distinct ways of defining transfer education. The first of these is to consider the transfer program, the recommended sequences listed in the catalogs. Here the students are advised to take certain courses in their first, second, third, and fourth semesters at the college in order to qualify for transfer to certain programs at various senior institutions. This interpretation of the transfer function is almost pure fantasy. Not one student in one hundred takes those courses in the recommended sequence in the time prescribed and then goes on through to the associate degree and to the senior college. Few of the courses listed have prerequisites and students take them in whatever order suits their private schedules. Students drop in and out of the institution, taking major program requirements now, general education requirements another time, and electives -- all without concern for the pattern recommended. Defining the transfer function by persuing the sequences in the transfer program as listed in the catalogs is illusionary.

Defining transfer education by viewing transfer courses is somewhat better, but not much. The students in an art class may be enrolled "for transfer credit;" they may also have baccalaureate degrees already and enroll in the course only so that they may paint under direction. The students in a secretarial skills course may be there to learn to operate word-processing equipment; the fact that the course carries transfer credit is irrelevant to those who only want to stay long enough to learn skills sufficient to qualify them for a higher paying job. The students in a history class may do little work, perhaps not even show up regularly; they may be there to obtain the financial aid that is attendant upon their enrolling in a specified number of courses. The fact that all these courses carry transfer credit is an artifact of college accreditation, staffing, and financing; it has little to do with student intentions.

Considering the transfer function by assessing the number of students who participate in transfer courses perhaps comes closer to the mark. But here too we must be cautious. There is a wide divergence between the number of students who say they intend transferring and those who actually do transfer. In 1929, 80% of the students in California community colleges declared intentions of transferring to a senior institution. Nationally, between 1940 and 1960, the number of those who declared transfer intent hovered at around two-thirds of the student body. By the early 1970s the national figures showed that fewer than half the students intended transferring. Illinois colleges reflected the decline in intent; according to State Board figures, in 1968, 56% of the students declared transfer intent; in 1970, the figure had dropped to 44%; in 1974 it was 37% and in 1978, 32% of the matriculants declared transfer intention.

What happens to the students who do transfer? An examination of the transcripts of 3,955 (2,187 native and 1,768 community college transfers) students who received baccalaureate degrees at UCLA between 1976 and 1978 showed that the native students earned grade point averages approximately .2 of a point higher than the transfers; the transfers were 3.3 years older than the natives at graduation; the transfers took 1.4 years longer to earn a degree; a higher percentage of natives than transfers earned degrees in the natural sciences; and, when academic ability was controlled for by matching a subset of natives and transfers on an entering ability test, the natives still earned a grade point average .15 of a point higher than the transfers.

Depending on one's perspective, these figures may be applauded or deplored. Those who say that the community college should be in the business of sorting students and passing them through to institutions where they may receive the baccalaureate degree might well question the preparation that students are receiving at California community colleges. Those who argue that the community colleges have other functions more important than transfer might make light of the figures, saying that since transfer education is such a minuscule portion of the community college effort now, the UCLA data are irrelevant to the colleges' main purposes.

## Minorities in Two-Year Colleges

Minority-group students are overrepresented in two-year colleges in comparison with their enrollment in other sectors of higher education. Table 1 shows that of the 12 million students enrolled in all institutions of higher education in 1980, less than one percent are American Indian/Alaskan Native, two percent are Asian or Pacific Islander, nine percent are black, almost four percent are of Hispanic origin, and 81 percent are white. The percentage distribution for each racial category among universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges in contrast to their overall participation rate in higher education reveals the clustering. For instance, although Hispanics represent four percent of all students in higher education institutions, they represent almost six percent of the total enrollment in two-year institutions.

The data on the percentage distribution of students in public institutions show that both Hispanics and blacks are seriously underrepresented in public universities. The proportion of blacks in public two-year colleges (10.1%) is twice as high as the proportion in public universities (5.1%). Among Hispanics the distribution is even more skewed, the proportion in public community colleges is three time higher (5.8%) than in public universities (1.9%). American Indians and Asians, in contrast to blacks and Hispanics, are more evenly distributed among the public sector institutions.

Data on the participation rate of minorities in private sector institutions show that the proportion of Hispanics in universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges is about equal. The high proportion of blacks in private two-year colleges (17.9%) can be attributed to enrollments in private traditionally black institutions.

Table 1

Percentage of minority enrollment in institutions of higher education by type and control of institution, Fall 1980.

| Institutional Types | N | American Indian/ Alaskan Native | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black | Hispanic | White |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Institutions | (12,086,808) | 0.7 | 2.3 | 9.2 | 3.9 | 81.4 |
| Universities | (2,902,014) | 0.4 | 2.4 | 5.4 | 2.1 | 85.6 |
| Other 4-year Institutions | (4,663,387) | 0.5 | 2.0 | 10.2 | 3.3 | 81.3 |
| 2-year Institutions | (4,521,407) | 1.0 | 2.8 | 10.4 | 5.6 | 78.7 |
| Public Institutions | (9,456,423) | 0.8 | 2.5 | 9.3 | 4.3 | 81.0 |
| Universities | (2,154,283) | 0.5 | 2.3 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 86.7 |
| Other 4-year Institutions | (2,973,358) | 0.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 3.9 | 79.9 |
| 2-year Institutions | (4,328,782) | 1.0 | 2.8 | 10.1 | 5.8 | 78.8 |
| Private Institutions | (2,630,385) | 0.4 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 2.5 | 82.8 |
| Universities | (747,731) | 0.3 | 2.6 | 6.2 | 2.7 | 82.5 |
| Other 4-year Institutions | (1,690,029) | 0.3 | 1.5 | 8.8 | 2.4 | 83.7 |
| 2-year Institutions | (192,625) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 17.9 | 2.8 | 75.5 |

Note: The row percentages do not add up to 100% because non-resident aliens have been omitted.

Source: The raw data to calculate enrollment distribution by type of institution and control were drawn from Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84 (NCES, 1983).

Table 2 examines the distribution of students by racial/ethnic background in different types of public institutions. In this table, however, the proportion of students in different institutional types has been calculated on the basis of each group's total enrollment in the public sector. For example, of the 876,000 black students attending public institutions, 50 percent are enrolled in community colleges. As shown in this table, among the four minority groups, 50 percent or more of those attending public institutions are concentrated in community colleges. In contrast, the proportion of whites in community colleges is about 45 percent. American Indians, Asians, and Hispanics compared to whites and blacks are underrepresented in four-year colleges. The higher concentration of blacks in public four-year colleges is likely to be due, in part, to their enrollment in traditionally black institutions. With the exception of Asians, all other minority groups appear to be underrepresented in public universities.

Table 2

Distribution of total enrollment in public sector institutions by type and racial/ethnic category for Fall 1980.

| Ethnic Group | Total Enrollment | Universities | 4-Year Colleges | 2-Year Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native | 74,224<br>(100.0) | 10,121<br>(13.6) | 18,921<br>(25.5) | 45,182<br>(60.9) |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 239,710<br>(100.0) | 48,782<br>(20.4) | 68,393<br>(28.5) | 122,535<br>(51.1) |
| Black | 876,070<br>(100.0) | 110,533<br>(12.6) | 327,644<br>(37.4) | 437,893<br>(50.0) |
| Hispanic | 406,150<br>(100.0) | 41,220<br>(10.1) | 115,174<br>(28.4) | 249,756<br>(61.5) |
| White | 7,656,094<br>(100.0) | 1,866,896<br>(24.4) | 2,376,121<br>(31.0) | 3,413,077<br>(44.6) |
| Nonresident Alien | 204,175<br>(100.0) | 76,731<br>(37.6) | 67,105<br>(32.9) | 60,339<br>(29.6) |
| Total | 9,456,423<br>(100.0) | 2,154,283<br>(22.8) | 2,973,358<br>(31.4) | 4,328,782<br>(45.8) |

Notes: These data include undergraduate and graduate enrollment in public sector institutions. Raw data were drawn from Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84, (NCES, 1983). Distribution of enrollment by ethnic/racial groups in public two-year colleges for fall 1980 was calculated as a percentage of each group's enrollment in public institutions.

Table 3 shows the proportion of students enrolled in two-year public colleges as a percentage of their total participation rate in all institutions of higher education. Even though the concentration of students in public community colleges is of a lesser magnitude when their total participation rate in higher education is used as the base, more than half of all American Indian and Hispanic students participating in higher education attend public community colleges. In contrast, among white students, slightly more than one-third are concentrated in the public two-year college sector.

While it is possible that the large concentration of Hispanic students in two-year colleges might be due to the inclusion of Puerto Rico's public institutions in the data base, it should be noted that 63 percent of the students enrolled in Puerto Rico's colleges and universities attend private sector institutions (Consejo de Educacion Superior, 1983).

Table 3

Proportion of enrollment by racial/ethnic categories in public two-year colleges as a percentage of total enrollment for Fall 1980.

| Ethnic Group | Total Enrollment In All Institutions (Public and Private) | Enrollment In Public Two-Year Colleges |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native | 83,903<br>(100.0) | 45,182<br>(53.9) |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 286,446<br>(100.0) | 122,535<br>(42.8) |
| Black | 1,106,750<br>(100.0) | 437,893<br>(39.6) |
| Hispanic | 471,717<br>(100.0) | 249,756<br>(52.9) |
| White | 9,833,012<br>(100.0) | 3,413,077<br>(34.7) |
| Nonresident Alien | 304,980<br>(100.0) | 60,339<br>(19.8) |
| Total | 12,086,808<br>(100.0) | 4,328,782<br>(35.8) |

Note: Raw data were drawn from Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84, (NCES, 1983).

Some groups have questioned whether the community colleges' effect on a student's chances to gain a baccalaureate is different for minority and majority group students. Allegations of differential treatment, or at least differential effects, on minority students have been made, but the data are scanty. Many of the reports assume a black box: since more minority students enter community colleges than universities, and since fewer community college matriculants eventually receive baccalaureate degrees as compared with students who begin their career as freshmen in a university, then the community college must be doing something that militates against minority group student transfer. No one has documented exactly what that something might be. Most who have tried have contrasted community college and university environments. However, the researcher studying the question of community college effect should compare differential treatment across community colleges, not between community colleges and universities.

The reason is that for most of the people who begin their higher education career in a community college, the university freshman class is not an option; hence to say that the community college treats its students differently from the university makes for interesting but useless comparisons. Furthermore, it is not possible to duplicate the university environment in a community college. No community college has a library with a million-plus volumes, a faculty comprised of doctoral-level people engaged in scholarly inquiry, a selective admissions policy that ensures a student peer group of high academic achievement. In sum, to say that the university environment is different and that this difference may account for the higher proportion of university freshmen going on to the baccalaureate makes no sense at all.

Another question relates to the community colleges' success in assisting people to achieve their goals. How many students enter the community college with intention of obtaining a baccalaureate degree? Surveys asking that question reveal incredibly high numbers, as high as 80%. Further examination of the data reveal that students who are obviously taking only a few courses preparing them to obtain immediate employment still say that they intend getting higher degrees; no one wants to admit that he or she has closed off life's options. Accordingly, relating degree attainment with declared intention is precarious.

A different kind of question regarding transfer education can be put, this time in an examination of college procedures: What is the "transfer program?" To qualify for the definition, "program," a set of activities should have coherence, direction, support services, internal monitoring procedures, and so on. This form of organization applies most directly to the occupational programs in community colleges but not to the activities designed to lead students to transfer. The occupational programs have selective entry, sequenced curriculum, enforced prerequisites, especially designated staff, coordinated student job-placement functions, and usually some form of student follow-up. The transfer-related activities are by no means so organized. This may account for the fact that since 1975, community colleges have awarded more associate degrees to graduates of occupational programs than to graduates of so-called transfer programs.

Nonetheless, since progress through the education system is important for a group's status and income, the issue of transfer remains an important one for people concerned with the education of minorities. As an example, the community colleges are the point of first entry for over half the students of Hispanic origin who begin higher education in the United States. The reasons for this are obvious: half the Hispanics in the United States live in California and Texas where community colleges are the point of entry for most students. In fact, 85% of all undergraduates in California are in community colleges; 58% in Texas. Therefore all questions of Hispanic students' progress from college entry to the baccalaureate must be viewed in a community college context. But, at the same time, questions of the progress of Hispanic students in community colleges must be placed in the context of those students in the other levels of schooling. The figures are as follows: of 100 white students entering the educational system, 83 graduate high school, 38 enter college, 23 receive a bachelor's degree, 14 enter graduate or professional school, and eight receive a graduate or professional degree. Of 100 Hispanic students entering the system, 55 graduate high school, 23 enter college, seven receive a bachelor's degree, four enter graduate or professional school, and two receive a graduate or professional degree.

These data, and similar figures for black students, reveal that white and minority students progress differentially through the system at all levels. Fewer minorities graduate from high school, fewer enter college, fewer complete college, and so on. This raises an important point: those who charge the community colleges with failing to facilitate transfer for minorities rarely consider all the data. Fewer community college students of any ethnicity receive baccalaureate degrees when compared with students who enter universities at the freshman year. And fewer minority students progress through the school system, regardless of the level or environment in which members of that group are examined.

What have the community colleges done? They have provided access, not only to minority students but to all people desiring higher education. They have made it possible for the ratio of minority college students to the percentage of minorities in the total population to come closer to parity in states with high minority populations. The following percentages held in 1976: in Arizona, 15% of the population was Hispanic; 11% of the college-age Hispanics were in community colleges; in California, 16% and 10%; in Colorado, 11% and 9%; in New Mexico, 34% and 16%; in Texas, 20% and 17%; in Florida, 7% and 7%. For the United States as a whole, 5.3% of the 18 to 24 year-olds were Hispanic and 8.2% of that group were in community colleges (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, pp. 42-43).

These figures vary from state to state, depending on the level of community college development and on the relative accessibility of the universities. In some areas the community colleges are in balance with the local population: El Paso, Texas, has 63% Hispanic population; in El Paso Community College 63% of the students are Hispanic (Farrell, 1984). On the other hand, based on the percentage of minorities in a university relative to the total number of minorities in higher education in the state, the universities in many states are severely under-enrolled. These include Texas A & M and the University of Texas at Austin; the University of Florida; the University of California's campuses at

Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and San Diego; and flagship universities in Arizona, New York, Colorado, Alabama, and South Carolina (Astin, 1982).

These data cannot of themselves be interpreted accurately. How many students intended obtaining bachelor's degrees when they entered community colleges? According to the annual freshman survey conducted by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at UCLA, among fulltime freshmen entering community colleges, 80% aspired to at least a bachelor's degree (Astin, 1982). But when all entering students are considered, as in studies done in Virginia, Maryland, California, and Washington, the proportion of bachelor's degree aspirants drops to between 15 and 33% of the community college population (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 46).

The progress of all students through two-year colleges is less direct than through senior institutions. Community colleges have been quite liberal in allowing students to enter regardless of their prior academic achievement, encouraging commuter and part-time attendees, and developing programs that do not lead students in the direction of traditional bachelor's degrees. According to data provided by Astin (1982), for students who entered college in 1971 and who said they intended obtaining at least a bachelor's degree, the following percentages completed a degree program by 1980: in all institutions, 51% of the blacks completed the degree; 24% of those who entered two-year colleges. For Hispanics, 40% of those entering all institutions, 20% of those entering two-year colleges; Puerto-Ricans, 42% in all institutions, 27% in two-year colleges; whites, 56% in all institutions, 29% in two-year colleges.

The data obscure as much as they reveal. Aggregating data by an entire college system in a state or for the nation obscures what individual institutions are doing. Aggregating data for an entire population obscures what uses individual students are making of the institutions. However, these problems apply to any general data set. The more serious flaw in the data about community college transfers is that they have errors and some data are missing.

The California State University System has a standard reporting form that asks for the number of students transferring into each of its 18 campuses. On some campuses the form is completed by the registrar, in others by a research officer, and in still others by a transcript evaluator. Which students are called transfers from community colleges? Those who appear with at least 15 units earned? Those whose college of last attendance was a community college? Some reporters use one definition, some use another. Which students are Hispanic? The California Post-Secondary Education Commission reports, "Since some of the five campuses with high percentages of unknown ethnicity might be expected to have relatively large enrollments of Blacks and Chicanos among their transfers, statewide enrollments of these ethnic groups in the state university may be underestimated in recent reports (CPEC, 1982, p. 9)." In other words, of all transfers to the University of California in any one year, 10% are "ethnicity unknown" and of all transfers to California State University, in recent years, between 16% and 37% have been "ethnicity unknown."

Missing data also include what is being learned by students in community colleges, how well they are being prepared to enter senior institutions. These data are necessary to determine the community colleges' actual effect. As a way of considering the learning attained by community college students, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges developed a test of student knowledge in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, mathematics, and English usage. The Center administered this test to a sample of approximately 8,000 students enrolled in transfer credit courses in the community colleges of Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, and St. Louis in 1983-84. Among the results was the finding that Hispanics scored higher than blacks but lower than whites. The Hispanic students in Los Angeles, most of whom are of Mexican descent and those in Miami, most of whom are of Cuban decent, had nearly identical scores. In Miami, Hispanics scored higher than blacks even when controlling for English as a native language; that is, the non-native English-speaking Hispanics scored higher than the native English-speaking black students. In Los Angeles scores for native English-speaking blacks and non-native English-speaking Hispanics were approximately equivalent (Riley, 1984a, Riley, 1984b).

Issues of transfer relate to characteristics of the community colleges and of the receiving institutions, the universities and four-year colleges to which students would transfer. There is no question that fewer students obtain a bachelor's degree if they begin their college career in a community college than if they begin at a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Astin points out that among students entering public higher education, 76% of the whites but only 49% of the Hispanics were still in school two years later. He attributes the extremely high attrition rate of Hispanics to their tendency to begin post-secondary education in the community colleges. Although he admits, "It is probably true that, were it not for community colleges, many minority students would not attend college at all," he questions the policies that allocate resources differentially to two-year and four-year colleges (Astin, 1982, p. 152). In another part of his analysis of minorities in higher education, he points out that "Public policy generally has focused on the issue of access to any post-secondary institution, assuming approximately equivalent effects and benefits of college attendance (p. 121)." In other words, he is intent on communicating the message of differences between colleges, saying that access is not a unitary concept.

Thus, the question of whether community colleges are beneficial to minority students is unresolved. If sizeable percentages of minority students would not attend any college unless there were a community college available, then community colleges have certainly helped minorities, along with all kinds of students. But if the presence of a convenient community college discourages minorities from attending senior institutions, thus reducing the probability of their completing the baccalaureate, then for those students who wanted degrees the college has been detrimental.

What happens within the community colleges? The first issue is that those colleges have fewer resources to expend. The universities spend 60% more on their education and general expenditure category. They spend 20% more in instruction, 50% more for their libraries, 100% more for financial aid, and 1000% more on research (Astin, 1982, p. 143). Therefore, people beginning community college enter an environment in which the institution simply does not have equivalent funds.

Other problems exist within the institution. Avila notes such internal issues as, "Inadequate communication regarding existing admissions for transfers; inadequate orientation for transfers; unsatisfactory communication of regulations, procedural changes and other information needed by counselors/advisors of transfer students; and complex admissions and registration procedures which frustrate many potential transfer students (1983, p. 12)." Astin says, "Apparently community colleges are not set up to elicit strong student involvement in and commitment to the collegiate experience, at least not to the extent that other academic institutions are. Lacking such involvement and commitment, students are more apt to withdraw from post-secondary education (Astin, p. 8)." This suggests that because community college students tend to be attending part-time, commuting rather than residing on campus, and enjoying less opportunity for on-campus jobs, their enrollment continuance is jeopardized because they never do become sufficiently involved with college life.

The charge that the academic programs within community colleges are not sufficiently demanding has also been leveled. Richardson and his associates analyzed the literacy demands being placed on students in one community college district and concluded that the very process of reading and writing had been reduced to a set of minuscule bits; expectations of reading for pleasure, style, or overall content had been all but eliminated (Richardson and Others, 1982). Avila concluded his indictment with the statement, "At present, it appears that the caliber of some community colleges is such that it does not prepare students for rigorous academic work (p. 19)."

There are problems in the nature of relationships between community colleges and receiving institutions. The well-developed community college systems in Arizona, California, and Texas account for the high proportion of Hispanic students in those three states, but articulation policies there make transfer less likely than it is in Florida. In Florida about 15% of the entering community college students complete two years and transfer; in California, 3%. The California State University receives more than 30,000 transfers per year compared with 5,000 students transferring to the University of California. Reasons include proximity (18 campuses compared with nine), occupationally-oriented baccalaureate programs such as business and accounting, lower costs, fewer costs, fewer course-credit challenges, and a grade point average requirement that sees the CSU allowing students with a 2.0 to transfer whereas the University of California requires a minimum of 2.4 (CPEC, 1982). The staff at El Paso Community College report that the University of Texas at El Paso limits the number of credits that can be transferred (Farrell, 1984).

The types of students entering community colleges present yet another force in mitigating transfer. On average, students who begin community colleges have lower high school grades, lower entrance test scores, and a less well-developed commitment to receiving the baccalaureate. The very fact that they must change colleges, change environments and social relationships, and learn new sets of rules makes successive transfer difficult. However, it is important to add that these characteristics of both institutions and individuals do not work differentially for members of ethnic minority groups. As Hunter and Sheldon put it at the conclusion of their longitudinal study of community college students in California, "Among ethnic minorities, it was found that very few students had problems arising from their minority status (1980, p. 60)."

It is easy to document problems for transfers, less easy to trace what is being done. Large-scale data sets obscure individual institutions. However, there are a few reports of efforts especially designed to encourage transfer. In general, financial aid has become more readily available over the past 20 years. This is an enhancement to all students, especially those from low-income families because it ameliorates the negative effect of foregone earnings while attending college, even for students in the relatively low cost community college. Affirmative action rules and compliance offices on the national level have also raised the consciousness of people who are dealing with minority students on campus. Within the states, standards for high school graduation have been tightened in the past few years. Eventually this should have a salutary effect since students entering community colleges will be better prepared.

Philanthropic foundations, too, have turned their attention to minority students in community colleges. The Ford Foundation's community college initiative is designed to assist community colleges in increasing the transfer rate for their minority students. The succeeding chapters of this report detail the process of awarding grants to colleges, describe the characteristics of the colleges that received the grants, report the findings of surveys of the faculty and students in those colleges, outline the projects conducted to facilitate transfer within the colleges, and provide a summary and recommendations for strengthening the transfer function.

## CHAPTER TWO:

## SELECTING THE GRANTEES

From August 31st to September 2nd,1983, several people met at Princeton, New Jersey for the purpose of reviewing 63 grant proposals made to the Ford Foundation for the first phase of the Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP Phase I). Representatives from the Ford Foundation (Alison Bernstein, Estela Bensimon) met with the seven people who comprised the selection committee -- David Breneman, K. Patricia Cross, Evelyn Davila, Kenneth Haskins, Dorothy Knoell, Tomas Rivera (who died before he could be interviewed), Connie Sutton, and Steven Zwerling. In December 1984 and January 1984, phone interviews were conducted with these seven selection committee members, and an attempt was made to reconstruct the dynamics and thinking of their meeting. Since the selection panel had met over a year before being interviewed, and since several members had subsequently participated in other panels, some felt a bit hazy about their recollections. Yet, they were very clear on certain points and willing to offer their views. A synthesis follows of responses to the five open-ended questions by these seven individuals.

*Question I: How were the selections made for the Ford Foundation Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP)?*

Each member of the panel was mailed a package of several proposals, together with the list of criteria and rating scale that had been developed by the Ford Foundation. Some members read these proposals prior to meeting at Princeton; others "crammed" during the 2 1/2 day meeting. Then the members met in groups and discussed the proposals that they had read and rated. These discussions were assisted by representatives from the Ford Foundation and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), who acted as facilitators and encouraged the group to re-read and re-think the proposals.

After each person had assigned a rating to each of the proposals for which he/she was responsible, the facilitators attempted to obtain an amalgamated rating and then some type of consensus. This consolidated rating was derived after open discussions about the proposals. For example, "One person might come in with a top rating for a particular institution and after hearing the discussions, might then reduce that rating". An attempt was also made to categorize the proposals into a certain type, such as counseling or recruiting students from high school. Both the quality and nature of the proposals were considered.

Two people felt that the selection panel should have included more representatives from community colleges. Another noted that one of the satisfying things about the selection process was the fact that Ford was ready to issue an immediate press release about the grant and the selected recipients. This was gratifying to the panel who felt their work was taken into consideration and that there was a conclusion or gestalt to the procedure.

Another panel member stressed the peculiarity of the weighting system used in the selection process. Since the scale included five points, and since people typically tend to emphasize the second, third, and fourth rating points, those who did select one of the two extremes could throw the mean score -- and thus, the decision to select or reject a proposal. This particular person felt that personal or individual evaluations were not used, but those of the group as a whole because each rater would arrive at a number for a particular proposal and then the score was added to the scores of other raters. The average score became the deciding factor. If, again, a person used a one or a five, he/she could very well be the swing person. The process was efficient as far as time was concerned but, because of the type of scale used, qualitative considerations were not always made.

Question II: Do you think that the process lead to the best 24 colleges selected for participation? Should there have been more than 24? Fewer?

Responses to this second question varied somewhat. One person noted that the Ford Foundation had originally wanted to select 25 institutions, but they were hard pressed to go beyond 24. Other people felt they had to stretch to get to 24; "there weren't many good, fundable projects". Under pressure, some remarked, the group could have decided on 15 institutions. At the same time, one respondent felt it was a good thing that the 24 were chosen because Ford had the money, and because some institutions that had submitted lesser quality proposals and did not start out well initially ended up achieving a great deal. And conversely, some colleges with the highest hopes did not turn out to be successful. "It's nice to have the unusual luxury that

Ford had given of including some mediocre proposals, which then turned out to be very good projects". But a recurring theme to some people revolved about the issue of whether the "right colleges" had applied for the grants.

One person was vehement about the difficulty in selecting colleges because the institutions were both different and at different stages of development. Should the colleges be compared on the same criteria? A better job would have been done, said this respondent, if the selection panel had looked at the developmental levels of the various institutions involved.

Timing also entered into the picture. Because proposal writing was during the summer, many people were away who might have written stronger plans. This may have greatly changed the distribution of grants or, at the least, had some effect on the program.

At the same time, and contradicting other statements, one member of the selection committee was surprised with the quality of the proposals, and felt that many proposals deserved support. If a college did not make the first cut, UCCTOP I with 24 funded, it was out from further consideration. This was regrettable in several cases, said that respondent.

Question III: What were the criteria used in selecting the colleges? Who devised them? Other criteria?

The selection criteria were developed by Ford and these were adhered to, but two other factors entered into the picture -- geographic location and the reputation of the colleges and/or college president. Although the process of selection was "clean", and sophisticated, these two additional variables sometimes tilted the results, in fact, geographic location often weighed heavily on a decision to include -- or exclude -- an institution. Private knowledge about an institution that was held by some selectors (awareness of the political climate, the state of institutional turmoil, and leadership quality) was also a prime consideration in selection. These were basic criteria not mentioned in the check list devised by Ford, but they certainly "came into play in the final discussions".

One criticism of the selection process was that little consideration was paid to connecting institutions. No criterion considered the receiving or feeding institutions that would be linked with the grant recipient. If two parties were involved -- two institutions -- the quality of both should have been considered.

Question IV: Can you comment on the selection process -- as, for example, what did you think about the way it was handled? What were the dynamics involved?

Some responses to this question have been incorporated in earlier comments. Generally, people felt that the process was tedious, exacting, and positive. They also stressed the hidden criteria -- geography and leadership/reputation of institutions -- alluded to earlier.

One person again pointed to different developmental stages that precluded an even reaction, while another stressed an earlier concern -- that more people directly involved with community colleges were not included in the selection panel. This same person, as well as one other, was less satisfied with the final round of five institutions receiving the larger grant.

Another panel member lamented the lack of discussion in the selection groups as well as the limited size of the group. "The procedure as a whole was too mechanistic; too much of a quantitative rather than a qualitative nature. No attention was paid to innovation -- someone saw a certain way of looking at the system and pursued that". For instance, geography was considered heavily, but not the types of variety inherent in the institutions nor the types of innovations proposed. In fact, one kind of innovation was perceived as the "most sophisticated" (translated as most desirable) and this was over-emphasized in the ratings. If other colleges stressed that particular type of activity, they tended to be judged more favorably. Some sophisticated proposals were submitted from colleges not funded, but these emphasized interactions between faculty and students rather than the mechanistic or computer programs that seemed to be the "darlings" of the group.

Difficulty in dealing with the subjectivity of the Academy for Educational Development Examiners was also noted. This applied to the funding for Phase II, but apparently it became a real issue with those from the selection panel who also were involved in the second phase choices.

Question V: Do you have any comments or suggestions for this or future projects?

This final question elicited a number of responses, although many of these focused on the Ford Foundation rather than the proposal of new ideas for further projects. The comments ranged from some personal peeves about follow-up involvement to comments that were more objective.

For example, the respondent who had felt a need for further involvement mentioned that although the selection process was effective, an orientation program might have been important. When the project was over, the follow-up was negligent, and this respondent now feels "quite alienated from the Ford grant". Although the selection panel's responsibility was to select, this person would have liked to have continued some involvement with the project.

The selection panel member who had previously stressed college developmental levels made two major points. One was, again, that it would have been better to examine and assess colleges if they were at the same developmental level. If Ford intends to continue the funding, the Foundation should decide that certain people or certain institutions need help at certain stages and others at others. The fact that all the colleges were urban and all had large enrollments of minority students does not mean that they are the same. This suggests a need for greater sensitivity to the politics of the institution and the process of granting funds.

And even if the community colleges did a "good job" in their projects, it would also depend upon the receiving colleges as to whether they are effective in increasing transfer rates. Elaborating on this point, it "depends on how hungry a college is in order to be involved. For example, a community college might be selected for its work with "X" four-year colleges. But what is necessary is an approach to the four-year colleges first.

Agreements should not come from the two year colleges alone; it depends upon how the four-year colleges see their involvement in the transfer and articulation processes". There must be a desire on the part of four-year colleges to get the students to transfer to their institution.

Although this present report deals with the reactions of panel members who selected the 24 institutions involved in UCCTOP I, two people were also responsible for the selection of the "big five". One of these individuals stressed the importance of the site visits in influencing the five choices for UCCTOP II recipients. The AED site visitors made their own rankings of the 24 colleges, and thus became advocates for particular institutions. 'While there is no such thing as being objective and people appreciated the subjectivity of the process, the site visit reports should have been folded into the process but the site visitors should not have been in the selection process itself". This selection panel member suggested that some people were more objective than others and that in order to equalize this, the people who had visited a college should have absented themselves in the process of selection for the five Phase II grants, much like one would absent himself/herself during an oral examination. The individuals should leave the room when the colleges that they had visited came up for selection.

Another point was that there were no in-session training programs. Guidelines for the AED evaluations were written, with some evaluators being much more sophisticated than the others. "The quality differed markedly. Less experienced people could have benefitted from the process of orientation and, in order to do something like this, one has to be a cultural anthropologist". Because some had more experience than others, the reports were very inconsistent. Institutions may be evaluated in various ways; one way would certainly include more preparation and more orientation for the people who were going to do the case studies. (There was a one day orientation and training session for stage one site visit evaluation on February 27, 1984. This was conducted by AED.)

When asked about any suggestions for the future, another panel member suggested that what was most needed was assistance to certain institutions that are really disadvantaged colleges with tremendous problems. This person pointed out the really "great things" being done at some colleges, and stressed the importance of finding some way for those who know how to help to assist those who don't. In other words, would it be possible for a team from one college to mentor a team from a less sophisticated college? This person likes the idea of one college helping another, and feels good about keeping the colleges together and perhaps exposing the type of help that the 24 colleges could give to other institutions not included in the Ford initiative.

A fourth panel member stated that the strongest proposals were those that were in touch with the four-year colleges and that the publicity was good. However, when asked about general comments or suggestions, this person stated that the question of transfer is much more than a minority problem and, although this is an understandable concern, it should not have been an exclusive one. Further, while there was total agreement on funding for the first seven or eight proposals, and the panel worked easily down into the next eight or nine, they had difficulty choosing the last six or seven because they were not good proposals.

In general, this person's comments would be that the colleges work with a two-year and four-year connection, and that there is the hope that the prestige of the Ford Foundation would generally emphasize and influence transfer across the board. There should be high-powered propaganda, and this goes beyond the actual money. The perceptions have to be that transfer is an important function and that the prestige given by the Ford Foundation would trickle down and influence other colleges throughout the country.

Another selection panel member felt that our (Center for the Study of Community Colleges) evaluation would be important and that it should be built on correcting past errors. Were innovations ignored that might have been represented in the granting process, and if so, why? Our recommendation should also suggest a greater variety of proposals for the future. More attention should be paid to more qualitative and less quantitative aspects. Also, bringing people together was not necessarily the best way; it might have been far more effective for each person to independently arrive at his/her assessment of the proposal and then send it into the Ford Foundation.

This person also asked whether Ford was planning future projects of this sort or "Did they feel that they had exhausted their interest in transfer?" It would be interesting to find out about the 63 originally submitting proposals. Did the writing of a proposal actually stimulate further interest in the transfer phenomenon?

The final selection member noted "that a lot more needs to be looked at than has been examined now". In many ways, these urban, minority colleges are working with the kind of students who previously would not have attended college, and it is not clear enough what they serve and what they are doing, what their function is. Are they taking people out of the collegiate system or are they putting them in?

Other issues also need consideration. It is not settled what the major functions of the urban institutions really are. Are they an extension of high school or the beginning of college? This person does not quarrel with the definition of function, but believes that it has to be examined again. For example, "Information about Mid-west colleges is not applicable to the real inner-city colleges. We need to find a way of looking at the organization of big city colleges".

# CHAPTER THREE:

# CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UCCTOP COLLEGES

The primary purpose of the UCCTOP was to provide grants to community colleges that serve as the main entry point into higher education for minority and low-income groups. The intent of these grants was to strengthen programs and services related to one of the missions of community colleges: transfer education.

The data provided in this section illustrate characteristics of the 24 UCCTOP colleges such as size, enrollment patterns, and number and type of degrees conferred. Since reliable data on attrition and transfer rates could not be obtained for all the UCCTOP colleges, the profile is incomplete. Although an attempt was made to collect data on retention, it became clear in the early stages of the project that the majority of colleges do not collect follow-up data on student outcomes (other than degrees conferred). When they do have data gathering mechanisms they still face obstacles that are beyond their direct control.

In general, among the factors impeding a reliable data base are: (1) lack of procedures to classify students according to enrollment status differences; (2) lack of feedback systems to coordinate retrieval of information between sending community colleges and receiving senior institutions; and (3) the associate degree no longer considered a prerequisite to transfer. With regard to the first factor, most community colleges do not differentiate their students according to degree goals; all students regardless of whether they are enrolled as first-time students following a sequence of courses needed to obtain the associate degree or just taking a course for personal interest are classified as matriculated students, mainly because most institutions rely on funding formulas based on the number of students formally admitted and matriculated, regardless of degree aspirations.

Second, only some institutions routinely receive feedback information from senior institutions about transfer students. Students transferring to colleges out of state, transferring after a lapse of a few years, or transferring with less than a certain number of credits may be omitted from the data. And in some transfer data sets, students are counted as transfers whether they have completed three or 63 units at the community college.

Third, since students can transfer to senior colleges without first having earned the associate degree, the number of associate degrees conferred in transfer curriculums is not a useful measure of the number of students transferring to senior institutions. In fact, it appears that increasing numbers of students whose goal is to transfer do so without first earning the associate degree.

## Enrollment Patterns in the UCCTOP Colleges

In 1981-82, the 24 UCCTOP colleges had an aggregate credit-course enrollment of 258,264 students, about five percent of the total enrollment in U.S. public community colleges. Although between 1975-76 and 1981-82 enrollment in public community colleges experienced an increase of about 19 percent, the aggregate enrollment in the UCCTOP colleges during the same time period increased by only 9 percent.

As indicated in Table 4, twelve of the UCCTOP colleges experienced enrollment declines ranging from 2 percentage points for Miami-Dade Community College to 53 percentage points for Bronx Community College. The dramatic decline in headcount enrollment at Bronx Community College might be attributable to the introduction of tuition fees in all branches of the City University of New York.

The remaining eleven UCCTOP colleges experienced modest to dramatic increases in headcount enrollment. Enrollment increases of more than 100 percent were experienced by the San Diego City Community College, Houston Community College, and Los Angeles Mission College.

Table 5 shows changes in full-time equivalent enrollment in the UCCTOP colleges between 1976 and 1982. Eleven of the colleges experienced a decline in FTE enrollment during the six-year period. Los Angeles Harbor College, which increased in headcount enrollment by 14 percent during this period, had a slight decrease in FTE'S. On the other hand, Community College of Baltimore, in spite of a 12 percent decline in headcount enrollment, had an increase of 18 percent in FTE'S. Similarly, Roxbury experienced an increase in

FTE's of 11 percent, although total headcount enrollment decreased by 22 percent.

Average FTE enrollment for the 24 colleges in 1975-76 was 6,536 and in 1981-82 6,343, a decrease of about three percentage points.

## Table 4

## Headcount Enrollment for 1976 and 1982 by Institution

| Institution | 1975-76 | 1981-82 | Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 2,358 | 1,810 | (-23%) |
| South Mountain CC** | ---- | 1,124 | ---- |
| Compton CC | 7,246 | 6,540 | (-10%) |
| Los Angeles City College | 23,904 | 20,492 | (-14%) |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 11,037 | 12,541 | (+14%) |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 2,000 | 4,589 | (+129%) |
| West Los Angeles College | 7,893 | 11,079 | (+40%) |
| Sacramento City College | 14,340 | 13,612 | (-5%) |
| Laney College | 14,201 | 12,682 | (-11%) |
| San Diego City College | 5,979 | 15,132 | (+153%) |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus)* | 37,669 | 36,850 | (-2%) |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 3,982 | 5,190 | (+30%) |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 2,360 | 1,685 | (-29%) |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC* | 16,705 | 20,421 | (+22%) |
| Community College of Baltimore | 9,451 | 8,336 | (-12%) |
| Roxbury CC | 929 | 725 | (-22%) |
| Highland Park CC | 3,552 | 2,625 | (-26%) |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 13,937 | 6,606 | (-53%) |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 4,676 | 6,863 | (+47%) |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 2,636 | 2,990 | (+13%) |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus* | 27,710 | 25,725 | (-7%) |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 9,628 | 13,410 | (+39%) |
| Houston Community College | 7,226 | 17,102 | (+137%) |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 7,488 | 10,135 | (+35%) |
| Total for UCCTOP Colleges | 236,907 | 258,264 | (+9%) |
| Total Headcount in U.S. Public Two-Year Colleges | 3,922,715 | 4,834,433 | (+23%) |

Data Sources: Data on headcount enrollments were collected for 1975-76 from the 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory and for 1981-82 from the 1983 Directory. For 1975-76, the figures reflect enrollment as of October 1976 and for 1981-82, the figures reflect enrollment as of October 1982. Each institution was asked to review the data and make corrections wherever applicable; in all instances the corrections provided have been incorporated into this table.

* Data for Miami-Dade, University of Kentucky Community College system, and Cuyahoga Community College District reflect all campuses and institutions in their systems; however, only North Campus, Metropolitan Campus, and Jefferson Community College are participants in UCCTOP.

** South Mountain began to offer classes in 1980.

## Table 5

### FTE Enrollment for 1975-76 and 1981-82

| Institution | 1975-76 | 1981-82 | Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 2,200 | 1,636 | (-26%) |
| South Mountain CC** | ---- | 701 | ---- |
| Compton CC | 4,156 | 3,143 | (-24%) |
| Los Angeles City College | 13,764 | 11,666 | (-15%) |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 6,406 | 6,300 | (-2%) |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 667 | 1,315 | (+97%) |
| West Los Angeles College | 5,145 | 5,443 | (+6%) |
| Sacramento City College | 9,261 | 8,918 | (-4%) |
| Laney College | 7,162 | 6,055 | (-15%) |
| San Diego City College | 4,500 | 7,773 | (+73%) |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus)* | 25,570 | 22,347 | (-13%) |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 3,052 | 3,659 | (+20%) |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 1,786 | 1,048 | (-41%) |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC* | 12,133 | 13,657 | (+13%) |
| Community College of Baltimore | 5,222 | 6,150 | (+18%) |
| Roxbury CC | 613 | 682 | (+11%) |
| Highland Park CC | 2,703 | 2,278 | (-16%) |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 7,794 | 5,421 | (-30%) |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 3,621 | 6,284 | (+74%) |
| City University of NY- Hostos CC | 2,275 | 2,788 | (+23%) |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus* | 15,551 | 14,637 | (-6%) |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 7,627 | 8,140 | (+7%) |
| Houston Community College | 4,662 | 6,923 | (+48%) |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 4,458 | 5,264 | (+18%) |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 6,536 | 6,343 | (-3%) |

Data Sources: Data on FTE's for 1975-76 and 1981-82 were provided by NCHEMS from Higher Education General Information Survey data tapes. Each institution was asked to review the data and make corrections wherever applicable. In all instances, except one, the corrections made by the institutions have been incorporated into this table. In the instance of one institution, their corrected figures for FTE's were not incorporated because they exceeded headcount enrollment.

* Data for Miami-Dade Community College reflect all campuses; however, only North Campus is a participant in UCCTOP. Data for Cuyahoga Community College district reflect all campuses; however, only Metropolitan Campus is a participant in UCCTOP. Data for the University of Kentucky Community College System reflect its 13 colleges; however, only Jefferson Community College in Louisville is a participant in UCCTOP.

** South Mountain College began to offer classes in 1980.

## Minority Enrollment in the UCCTOP Colleges

Table 6 presents the proportion of minority students at the 24 UCCTOP colleges in 1976 and 1982. In 1976 there were 9 colleges where minorities made-up two-thirds or more of total headcount enrollment, whereas in 1982 there were 11. Moreover, increases in minority enrollments were experienced by 14 of the colleges. Average minority enrollment in the UCCTOP colleges was 67 percent in 1976 and 1982.

## Table 6

Total minority enrollment in percentages for 1976 and 1982 by institution.

| Institution | Percentage Minority Enrollment 1976 | 1982 | Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 98.8% | 99.7% | +0.9% |
| South Mountain CC | ---- | 77.7 | ---- |
| Compton CC | 91.2 | 94.3 | +3.1 |
| Los Angeles City College | 68.5 | 65.8 | -2.7 |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 41.4 | 46.8 | +5.4 |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 49.5 | 44.6 | -4.9 |
| West Los Angeles College | 61.5 | 62.0 | +0.5 |
| Sacramento City College | 40.3 | 44.0 | +3.7 |
| Laney College | 65.6 | 73.9 | +8.3 |
| San Diego City College | 40.9 | 51.3 | +10.4 |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus) | 45.9 | 64.0 | +18.1 |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 79.5 | 82.2 | +2.7 |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 100.0 | 85.8 | -14.2 |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC* | 15.5 | 10.0 | -5.5 |
| Community College of Baltimore | 80.3 | 75.2 | -5.1 |
| Roxbury CC | 88.4 | 90.2 | +1.8 |
| Highland Park CC | 97.3 | 95.3 | -2.0 |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 85.6 | 93.5 | +7.9 |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 64.2 | 81.4 | +17.2 |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 96.2 | 98.9 | +2.7 |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus | 63.6 | 28.6** | ----- |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 66.7 | 70.2 | +3.5 |
| Houston Community College | 51.0 | 33.8 | -17.2 |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 42.0 | 34.1 | -7.9 |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 66.7% | 66.8% | +0.1% |

Source: These data were gathered from the Office for Civil Rights.

* Data include all community colleges in the University of Kentucky Community College System.

** Minority enrollment for 1976 is for the Metro Campus only; however, for 1982 the data are for all the Cuyahoga Community College campuses, therefore changes have not been calculated.

## Degrees Conferred by the UCCTOP Colleges

Table 7 shows changes between 1975-76 and 1981-82 in the number of degrees conferred by the UCCTOP colleges in arts and science and occupational/technical fields. Only 7 of the colleges experienced an increase between 1976 and 1982 in the number of arts and science degrees conferred, whereas 15 experienced an increase in the number of degrees granted in occupational/technical fields. Additionally seven colleges experienced a decline in the number of degrees conferred in both arts and science and occupational/technical fields.

Table 8 shows changes in total degrees conferred by the UCCTOP colleges between 1975-76 and 1981-82. Twelve of the colleges experienced declines in the number of degrees conferred ranging from 14 to 62 percentage points; of these, six were in California.

Four colleges that experienced increases in headcount enrollment between 1976 and 1982 (Hostos, Community College of Philadelphia, J. Sargeant Reynolds, and West Los Angeles) during the some period had declines in degrees conferred. On the other hand, Miami-Dade Community College, Cuyahoga, State College, and Roxbury, all of which suffered enrollment losses between 1975-76 and 1981-82, increase in the number of total degrees conferred. Perhaps an unanticipated outcome of enrollment declines is an increase in productivity.

Table 9 shows changes in the proportion arts and science degrees represented of total degrees conferred in 1975-76 and 1981-82 in the UCCTOP colleges. Nationally in 1975-76 (see Table 7), 45 percent of degrees conferred by all two-year colleges were in arts and science which is about the same as the average for the UCCTOP colleges in 1975-76. However, in eleven of the UCCTOP colleges arts and science degrees represented less than 45 percent of total degrees conferred thus falling below the national average. By 1981-82, arts and science degrees represented about 37 percent of total degrees conferred by all two-year colleges; in contrast the average for the UCCTOP colleges was 42 percent, about four percentage points less than in 1975-76 but five percentage points higher than the national average. However, in 1981-82 the proportion of arts and science degrees conferred in 12 colleges fell below the national average -- that is, in these colleges less than 37 percent of the total degrees conferred were in arts and science.

Some colleges actually experienced an increase in the proportion that arts and science degrees represented of total degrees conferred in 1981-82: Miami-Dade Community College, Community College of Baltimore, Hostos Community College, San Diego City College, State College, and Los Angeles Mission College. In a few colleges less than one-fourth of the total degrees conferred in 1981-82 were in arts and science: Honolulu Community College, J. Sargeant Reynolds, and State College.

In South Mountain College, arts and science degrees were the only degrees conferred; however, it should be noted that this institution began to offer classes in 1980 and therefore does not have degree programs that are as extensive or as diverse as those found in other UCCTOP colleges.

Table 7

Total associate degrees and other awards in arts and science and occupational/technical fields conferred in 1975-76 and 1981-82.

| Institution | Arts and Science 1975-76 | Arts and Science 1981-82 | Arts and Science Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 | Occupational/Technical 1975-76 | Occupational/Technical 1981-82 | Occupational/Technical Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawson CC | 128 | 41 | (-68%) | 87 | 44 | (-49%) |
| South Mountain CC | ---- | 14 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Compton CC | 147 | 88 | (-40%) | 307 | 199 | (-35%) |
| Los Angeles City College | 540 | 311 | (-42%) | 679 | 645 | (-5%) |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 349 | 267 | (-23%) | 131 | 261 | (+99%) |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 14 | 77 | (+450%) | 13 | 24 | (+85%) |
| West Los Angeles College | 238 | 156 | (-34%) | 179 | 152 | (-15%) |
| Sacramento City College | 1102 | ---- | ---- | 770 | 786 | (+2%) |
| Laney College | 304 | 131 | (-57%) | 136 | 246 | (+81%) |
| San Diego City College | 179 | 375 | (+109%) | 416 | 836 | (+101%) |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus) | 4285 | 5830 | (+36%) | 1174 | 1571 | (+34%) |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 58 | 82 | (+41%) | 313 | 454 | (+45%) |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 7 | 36 | (+414%) | 72 | 245 | (+240%) |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC | 710 | 768 | (+8%) | 1036 | 1338 | (+29%) |
| Community College of Baltimore | 237 | 238 | (<1%) | 571 | 415 | (-27%) |
| Roxbury CC | 54 | 68 | (+26%) | 38 | 77 | (+103%) |
| Highland Park CC | 190 | 128 | (-33%) | 163 | 110 | (-33%) |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 356 | 138 | (-61%) | 819 | 367 | (-55%) |
| City University of NY - La Cuardia CC | 235 | 225 | (-4%) | 607 | 615 | (+1%) |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 113 | 118 | (+4%) | 147 | 71 | (-52%) |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus | 744 | 740 | (<1%) | 449 | 960 | (+114%) |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 480 | 280 | (-42%) | 544 | 566 | (+4%) |
| Houston Community College | 188 | 115 | (-39%) | 120 | 311 | (+159%) |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 63 | 37 | (-41%) | 224 | 309 | (+38%) |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 466 | 446 | (-4%) | 391 | 461 | (+18%) |

Note: These data do no include other formal recognition awards not considered eligible for continued work towards a bachelor's degree; however, associate degrees which may be considered terminal are included.

Source: Data on degree awards for 1975-76 and 1981-82 were provided by NCHEMS from Higher Education Information Survey data tapes. The figures provided include associate degrees and other formal recognition awards wholly or chiefly creditable to a bachelor's degree as well as associate degrees which may not be eligible for continued work towards the baccalaureate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

Total associate degrees and other awards conferred in 1975-1976 and 1981-1982.

| Institution | 1975-76 | 1981-82 | Percent Change, 1976 to 1982 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 215 | 81 | (-62%) |
| South Mountain CC | ---- | 14 | ---- |
| Compton CC | 454 | 287 | (-37%) |
| Los Angeles City College | 1219 | 956 | (-22%) |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 480 | 528 | (+10%) |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 27 | 101 | (+274%) |
| West Los Angeles College | 417 | 308 | (-26%) |
| Sacramento City College | 1872 | 789 | (-58%) |
| Laney College | 440 | 377 | (-14%) |
| San Diego City College | 595 | 1211 | (+104%) |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus) | 5459 | 7401 | (+36%) |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC* | 371 | 536 | (+44%) |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 79 | 281 | (+256%) |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC | 1746 | 2106 | (+21%) |
| Community College of Baltimore | 808 | 653 | (-19%) |
| Roxbury CC | 92 | 145 | (+58%) |
| Highland Park CC | 353 | 238 | (-33%) |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 1175 | 505 | (-57%) |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 842 | 840 | (<1%) |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 260 | 189 | (-27%) |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus | 1606 | 1700 | (+6%) |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 1024 | 846 | (-17%) |
| Houston Community College | 308 | 426 | (+38%) |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 451 | 346 | (-23%) |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 882 | 869 | (-1%) |

Source: Data on degrees awarded for 1975-76 and 1981-82 were provided by NCHEMS from Higher Education Information Survey data tapes. The figures provided include associate degrees and other formal recognition awards wholly or chiefly creditable to a bachelor's degree and associate degrees which may not be eligible for continued work towards a B.A. Formal recognition awards not considered eligible for continuation in a B.A. granting program are not reported, in most cases these figures were negligible.

Table 9

Associate degrees in arts and science as a percentage of total degrees conferred in 1975-76 and 1981-82.

| Institution | 1975-76 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 60.0% | 50.6% |
| South Mountain CC | -- | 100.0 |
| Compton CC | 32.4 | 30.7 |
| Los Angeles City College | 44.3 | 32.5 |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 72.7 | 50.6 |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 51.9 | 76.2 |
| West Los Angeles College | 57.1 | 50.6 |
| Sacramento City College* | 58.9 | N/A |
| Laney College | 69.1 | 34.7 |
| San Diego City College | 30.1 | 31.0 |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus) | 78.5 | 78.8 |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 15.6 | 15.3 |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 8.9 | 12.8 |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC | 40.7 | 36.5 |
| Community College of Baltimore | 29.3 | 36.4 |
| Roxbury CC | 58.7 | 46.9 |
| Highland Park CC | 53.8 | 53.8 |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 30.3 | 27.3 |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 27.9 | 26.8 |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 43.5 | 62.4 |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus | 62.4 | 43.5 |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 46.9 | 33.1 |
| Houston Community College | 61.0 | 27.0 |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 14.0 | 10.7 |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 45.6% | 42.1% |

Notes: Associate degrees in arts and science include degrees wholly or chiefly eligible for continued work toward the baccalaureate. Degrees in the following fields were classified as occupational or vocational: health services, data processing, natural science, business, public service, mechanics/engineering technologies. The raw data used to calculate proportion of arts and science as a percentage of total degrees conferred are presented in Table 9.

* For Sacramento City College data on arts and science degrees conferred in 1981-82 were unavailable due to an error in tabulating the information for the Higher Education Information Survey form.

Table 10 shows total degrees conferred as a percentage of full-time equivalent students. For instance, in Miami-Dade Community College total degrees conferred in 1975-76 represented 21 percent of FTE students, whereas in 1981-82 the proportion of degrees to FTE's rose to 33 percent.

Between 1975-76 and 1981-82, fourteen UCCTOP colleges experienced a decline in the total number of degrees conferred as a ratio of full-time equivalent students.

In both 1975-76 and 1981-82, the UCCTOP average for number of degrees conferred as a ratio of FTE'S was about 12 percent.

Table 10

Total degrees and other awards as a percentage of FTE's for 1975-76 and 1981-82.

| Institution | 1975-76 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| Lawson State CC | 10% | 5% |
| South Mountain CC | --- | 2 |
| Compton CC | 11 | 9 |
| Los Angeles City College | 9 | 8 |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | 7 | 8 |
| Los Angeles Mission College | 4 | 8 |
| West Los Angeles College | 8 | 6 |
| Sacramento City College | 20 | 9 |
| Laney College | 6 | 6 |
| San Diego City College | 13 | 16 |
| Miami-Dade CC (North Campus)* | 21 | 33 |
| University of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | 12 | 15 |
| State CC of East St. Louis | 4 | 27 |
| University of Kentucky - Jefferson CC* | 14 | 15 |
| Community College of Baltimore | 15 | 11 |
| Roxbury CC | 15 | 21 |
| Highland Park CC | 13 | 10 |
| City University of NY - Bronx CC | 15 | 9 |
| City University of NY - La Guardia CC | 23 | 13 |
| City University of NY - Hostos CC | 11 | 7 |
| Cuyahoga CC District - Metropolitan Campus* | 10 | 12 |
| Community College of Philadelphia | 13 | 10 |
| Houston Community College | 7 | 6 |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC - Downtown Campus | 10 | 7 |
| Average for UCCTOP Colleges | 12% | 12% |

Source: See Tables 5 and 9 for information on source of raw data used to calculate associate degrees and other awards as a percentage of FTE's.

### Summary Discussion

Changes experienced by the UCCTOP colleges between the mid-seventies and early 1980s indicate some important differences in the internal and external environments of these institutions.

As a group the colleges have experienced a slight increase in headcount enrollment; however, the increase was considerably lower than the nationwide average for public two-year colleges: 9 percent versus 19 percent. Despite an increase in headcount enrollment, the UCCTOP colleges, as a group, experienced a two percent decline in full-time equivalent students. The average proportion of minority students enrolled in the colleges remained stable; in both time periods the group average for minority enrollment was two-thirds of total enrollment.

The colleges as a group experienced a slight decline, about 4 percent, in the number of associate degrees conferred in arts and science between 1976 and 1982; on the other hand, there was an increase of 18 percent in the number of degrees conferred in occupational/technical fields. Overall the average number of total degrees conferred by the colleges was fairly stable between 1975-76 and 1981-82. Nonetheless, the group average for arts and science degrees as a percentage of total degrees declined by four percentage points.

Among the majority of the UCCTOP colleges, productivity as measured by the ratio of degrees conferred to full-time equivalent students is substantially low. Although the average for the group in degrees conferred as a percentage of full-time equivalents was 12 percent in 1976 and 1982, in the former year 12 of the colleges fell below the group mean whereas in the latter year the number falling below the mean had increased to 16. The majority of the UCCTOP colleges confer less than 12 degrees per 100 full-time equivalent students. Comparable figures for all two-year colleges (public and private) in 1981 indicate that on the average, two-year colleges confer 15 degrees per full-time equivalent students (Digest of Education Statistics, 1983).

Supplemental tables on other characteristics of two-year colleges, including revenues and expenditures are included in the appendix.

# CHAPTER FOUR:
# ADMINISTRATIVE AND GOVERNANCE ORGANIZATION

Differences among the UCCTOP colleges are evidenced in their administrative and governance organization as shown in Table 11. The colleges have been classified into four categories of administrative organization: multi-college districts, multi-campus systems, university systems, and single colleges. Eight of the UCCTOP colleges are part of multi-college districts; of these, seven are in California and one in Arizona. Of the seven California colleges, four are part of the Los Angeles Community College District -- the largest community college districts in the country. Three colleges belong to multi-campus systems; these colleges, unlike those that are part of a district, do not have presidents. North Campus (Miami-Dade Community College) is under the oversight of a vice president, Metropolitan Campus (Cuyahoga Community College District) and Downtown Campus (J. Sargeant Reynolds) have provosts. Five colleges are part of university systems; of these, three belong to the City University of New York (CUNY). The three CUNY community colleges have presidents while Jefferson Community College (University of Kentucky) is under a director and Honolulu Community College (University of Hawaii) is under a provost. Lastly, eight of the colleges are autonomous institutions in that they are not attached to other institutions or systems.

The types of governing boards overseeing the colleges have been classified into types: local and statewide. Local boards are those that have oversight for only one college, one district, or one multi-campus system while statewide boards have oversight of an entire state system. Within these two categories there are appointed and elected boards. Board appointments are usually made by the state governor or city mayor. In some instances the authority to appoint boards is shared by the governor and mayor, and in some states board members require state senate confirmation. Table 12 shows the governance organization among the UCCTOP colleges. Of the twenty-one colleges under local boards, 10 are appointed and 11 are elected. Only three colleges are under statewide boards; two of them -- Honolulu and Jefferson -- are part of a university system and therefore are under the Board of Regents for the entire university. Lawson State is under the Alabama State Board of Education, which is an elected body responsible for the state's community college system as well as the public school system.

Colleges that are part of a district or a multi-campus system or university system are under boards which oversee all of the institutions under those systems. Consequently, the colleges that are part of the Los Angeles Community College District are under a board that oversees the district's nine colleges. Colleges like the Community College of Philadelphia and Roxbury Community College, which are autonomous single-campus institutions, have their own boards.

Some states also have statewide coordinating boards for community collegs; the authority these boards have with regard to policymaking vary from state to state. The structure of these boards, however, is beyond the scope of this report.

## Table 11

## Administrative Organization

| Multi-College District | Multi-Campus System | University System | Single Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maricopa Co. CC District | Miami-Dade CC | University of Hawaii | Lawson State CC |
| South Mountain CC | North Campus | Honolulu CC | |
| | | | Compton CC[a] |
| Los Angeles CC District | Cuyahoga CC District | University of Kentucky | |
| Los Angeles City CC | Metropolitan Campus | Jefferson CC | State CC of East St. Louis |
| West Los Angeles CC | | | |
| Los Angeles Harbor CC | J. Sargeant Reynolds | City University of NY | Roxbury CC |
| Los Angeles Mission CC | Downtown Campus | Bronx CC | |
| | | Hostos CC | Highland Park CC |
| San Diego CC District | | La Guardia CC | |
| San Diego City College | | | CC of Philadelphia |
| Peralta CC District | | | Houston CC |
| Laney College | | | |
| | | | CC of Baltimore |
| Los Rios CC District | | | |
| Sacramento City College | | | |

Note: Multi-college districts and multi-campus systems are administratively different in that colleges under a district normally have a president while campuses within a multi-campus system have a provost or vice-president.

[a] Compton Community College is a district; however, since it is the only college in the district it has been placed under the single college category.

## Table 12

## Governance Organization

| Local Board | | Statewide Board | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Appointed | Elected | Appointed | Elected |
| Miami-Dade CC | South Mountain CC | Honolulu CC | Alabama State Board of Education[a]<br>Lawson State CC |
| State CC of East St. Louis | Los Angeles City CC | Jefferson CC | |
| CC of Baltimore | Los Angeles Harbor CC | | |
| Roxbury CC | West Los Angeles CC | | |
| Hostos CC | Compton CC | | |
| La Guardia CC | San Diego City College | | |
| Bronx CC | Sacramento City College | | |
| Cuyahoga CC | Laney CC | | |
| CC of Philadelphia | Highland Park CC | | |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds | Houston CC[b] | | |

Note: Appointments to boards may be made by the city mayor or state govenor or both. The difference between local and statewide appointed boards is that the former are responsible for a single college or multi-campus system while the latter are responsible for an entire state system. Community colleges belonging to districts or multi-campus systems have only one board responsible for all the colleges or campuses within the system.

[a] The Alabama State Board of Education oversees the state's community colleges and public school system.

[b] The board for Houston Community College also oversees the local public school system.

## Statewide Intersegmental Articulation

Since in most of the states community colleges serve the function of access to higher education for students who may aspire to a baccalaureate degree but for a variety of reasons are unable to begin their education in a senior institution, policies, guidelines, and other provisions have been enacted to facilitate transfer from the publicly controlled two-year colleges to public four-year colleges and universities. State articulation policies and guidelines were reviewed for all of the fifteen states in which there are UCCTOP colleges. The documents reviewed were requested in Summer 1983 and therefore any revisions or new policies adopted after that date are not reflected in this report.

The documents reviewed range from highly comprehensive legal documents (e.g., Florida) to very simple and short guidelines (e.g., Pennsylvania). In order to present the major provisions of these documents and facilitate comparison across states, the documents were classified into three rough categories (see Table 13). The most important of the three are policies that are formal or legally based (this category was borrowed from Kintzer, 1973) because they are part of formal resolutions or statutes and therefore, are enforceable. The second category consists of guidelines, also adopted at the state level; however, the prerogative for adhering to the guidelines is left to the discretion of the colleges. The last category includes voluntary agreements which may be drawn by two institutions or by segments or by groups of institutions. Voluntary agreements may include only public institutions or public and private institutions. In this report, the only type of voluntary agreements discussed are those which have been developed on a statewide level.

Despite this classification it must be noted that major differences exist within the categories. For instance, Kentucky's policy consists of no more than a few paragraphs in a state statute while Florida's consists of several pages. Moreover, guidelines in some respects are stronger than some states' policies. Consequently, to capture these differences Table 13 shows six provisions that may be included in statewide policies, guidelines, and voluntary agreements with a listing under each of the states that make such provisions. Of the fifteen states with UCCTOP colleges, only eleven (for this purpose CUNY is being treated as a "state") have at least one of the specified provisions. The missing states are Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, and Alabama. These states offer other alternatives for articulation and they will be described after the discussion that follows on the six provisions presented in Table 14.

## Table 13

### Types of Articulation Policies, Guidelines and Agreements In the UCCTOP States and Systems

| Formal/Legally Based Policies | | Guidelines | | Interinstitutional Voluntary Agreements |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | Systemic | State | Systemic | Statewide |
| Illinois | City University of NY | Virginia | Pennsylvania | California (State University and College System) |
| Texas | | Ohio | | Michigan |
| Maryland | | | | Arizona |
| Massachusetts | | | | Hawaii |
| Kentucky | | | | Alabama |
| Florida | | | | |

Table 14

Provisions made in statewide articulation policies, guidelines, and voluntary agreements

| Articulation Coordinating Committee | Course Equivalency Guides | Transfer Curriculum in Specialized Fields | Appeals Procedures | Guaranteed Admissions of 2-year Graduates | A.A. Degree considered as certification of completion of first 2-years of college/ or basic courses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maryland | Arizona | Texas | Maryland | Maryland | Maryland |
| Virginia | Florida (Common course numbering system and standardized transcript) | | Texas | CUNY | Ohio |
| Massachusetts | | | Massachusetts | | Massachusetts |
| Illinois | | | Florida | | Illinois |
| Arizona | | | Michigan (MACRAO Agreement) | | Florida |
| Florida | | | | | CUNY |
| California | | | | | Michigan (MACRAO Agreement) |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Provisions in Statewide Articulation Policies, Guidelines, and Voluntary Agreements

Articulation coordinating committee. Seven states include in their documents specific provisions for the formation of statewide committees with varying levels of authority to monitor the implementation of articulation policies and guidelines, review existing agreements and curricula, approve transfer curricula, and function as a court of appeals when disagreement on the award of transfer credits arise.

Florida's committee consists of 12 members appointed by the Commissioner of Education. The members are drawn from the public schools, community colleges, and state university system. The committee is charged with: (1) recommending plans for school district articulation relationships with community colleges and universities; (2) authorizing committees or task forces to facilitate articulation on subject areas between both levels of higher education; (3) reviewing the state's articulation policies; (4) reviewing appeals from students who have encountered difficulties in transferring (the decisions are considered to be advisory to the institutions concerned); (5) recommending policy or procedural changes to improve community college - university articulation systemwide; (6) making recommendations on research projects; (7) reviewing and approving experimental programs; (8) developing procedures to improve articulation by reviewing issues such as academic record form, general education requirements, course numbering systems, etc.; and (9) collecting and disseminating information on successful cooperative programs.

None of the articulation committees in the other states have responsibilities as extensive as Florida's nor as clearly spelled out. Generally, articulation committees in Massachusetts, Virginia, Illinois, Arizona, Maryland, and California act on an advisory capacity for a limited number of areas. Massachusetts, at the time this report was being prepared, was making major revisions of its articulation guidelines and among the changes being considered was an expansion of responsibilities for the Articulation Coordinating Committee.

Course equivalency guides. Arizona and Florida are the only states that have statewide course equivalency guides. Arizona's guide lists all courses offered by community colleges and indicates for each their eligibility for transfer credit (general elective, departmental elective, general studies) to Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and University of Arizona. Florida has a common course numbering system for all public institutions; additionally, there is a common community college/university transcript. Moreover, Florida's nine public universities have been required to develop counseling manuals listing the courses by programs that students need to take at the community college in order to qualify for transfer.

Miami-Dade Community College has developed a highly sophisticated computerized system in which all course equivalencies (for public and private colleges and universities), are matched by degree program with courses offered at MDCC. This system is particularly useful for students as well as counselors because it allows for continuous monitoring of individual progress. For instance, a student who has selected computer science as his/her major can log into the system and receive a print-out that lists all the required courses (in addition to the required general education sequence) needed to transfer to the computer science program at the University of Florida. The print-out also provides the students with the number of courses he/she has completed in the sequence as well as the grades earned for each course.

Among the many advantages of Miami-Dade's program is that any changes that take place with regard to course equivalencies due to curricular changes resulting from the addition of new courses, changes in course titles or numbers, or changes in transfer requirements can be made quickly through a change in the computer program. In contrast, it is more time-consuming and costly to maintain printed equivalency guides with up-to-date information.

Transfer curriculums in specialized fields. As of 1983, only Texas was actively involved in developing transfer curriculums in selected majors; however, the information provided is limited to the number of credits a student should complete in general discipline areas. Thus, although the transfer curriculum for business administration indicates the number of credits needed in areas such as accounting, economics, natural science, etc., it does not indicate the specific courses that will be accepted by receiving institutions. Consequently, these curriculums are only general guidelines and students are still required to consult with the university or college to which they plan to transfer in order to select appropriate courses.

Transfer curriculums in specified fields are most likely to be found at the interinstitutional level, rather than at the state level. Recently, more community colleges and four-year colleges have begun to develop interdepartmental articulation agreements. Some of the UCCTOP colleges used part of their grants for this purpose.

Appeals procedures. Maryland, Texas, Massachusetts, and Florida have specific procedures to resolve articulation-related problems. The articulation policy in Texas provides for either the staff of the Coordinating Board or for the appointment of a special committee to mediate transfer problems that cannot be resolved by institutional representatives. In Maryland, when differences of interpretation in the award of transfer credit cannot be resolved between the individual student and the receiving institution or between the sending and receiving institutions, appeals can be made to the Segmental Advisory Committee. The Committee's role in mediating complaints is limited inasmuch as the institutions are not obligated to abide by its recommendations. Similarly, in Massachusetts and Florida when appeals reach the state level, proposed solutions by state level committees are regarded only as advisory.

It is not unusual that state level committees responsible for mediating articulation problems are limited to an advisory role, were it to be otherwise it would constitute undue intrusion in the internal affairs of colleges and universities. What is important is not how much discretionary powers state level committees can exercise in the adjudication of interinstitutional articulation conflicts but rather the availability of a formal and impartial process to hear unresolved complaints from individuals or sending institutions. Moveover, states with appeals procedures are likely to be better informed (based on the number of complaints mediated), about articulation problems and, perhaps, as a result be more likely to strengthen intersegmental articulation through better designed policies or procedures.

Guaranteed admissions for community college graduates. According to Maryland's policy statement on transfer students, an individual "who has been awarded the Associate in Arts degree or who has successfully completed 56 hours of credit with an overall 2.0 average, in either case in college and university parallel courses, shall not be denied transfer to an institution." In cases where receiving colleges and universities have to curtail admissions for oversubscribed programs, they are required to develop criteria for admission "which provide equal treatment for native and transfer students." Students who qualified for admission to the four-year institutions as high school seniors are eligible for transfer regardless of credits earned as long as they have earned a 2.0 average in college and university parallel courses.

The City University of New York's policy on tranfer students from its community colleges to its senior institutions states that recipients of the A.A. or A.S. degree will "be accepted as matriculated students at a senior college of City University... and that upon transfer, they be granted a minimum of 64 credits toward a baccalaureate degree, and that...community college transfer students shall be required to complete only the difference in credits between 64 and the total credits required in the baccalaureate program in which the student enrolls; and... the mandated acceptance of 64 credits is not intended to restrict the senior colleges from the establishment of major requirements and prerequisites for those requirements."

Of the state documents revised, only CUNY's and Maryland's include language explicitly guaranteeing admission to a public senior college to community college graduates. Other states address this issue less forcefully. For instance, Ohio's guidelines state that a graduate "from a publicly-sponsored Ohio two-year institution of higher education should be admissible (within programmatic enrollment limits) to a baccalaureate program of a publicly-sponsored university on the same basis as a student whose lower-division study has taken place within the university itself." Similarly, Virginia's guidelines state that "completion of an appropriate two-year associate degree transfer program should normally assure upper division standing at the time of transfer; although this does not unconditionally guarantee transfer of all credits." Pennsylvania's policy states only that associate degree holders should be given preference for admission to state colleges.

The University of Kentucky and the University of Hawaii systems despite comprising two- and four-year colleges, unlike the CUNY system, do not have provisions guaranteeing admission to the systems' senior institutions to students who earn the associate degree from the systems' community colleges.

Although most states' publicly-supported systems of higher education are organized so as to provide access to students who do not qualify for admission to four-year colleges and universities as high school seniors through community colleges, few have enacted explicit policies that guarantee access to the senior colleges after completion of the associate degree. In states where public senior institutions are experiencing declining enrollments the absence of policies guaranteeing admission to associate degree holders are not likely to hinder transfer opportunities, particularly with regard to state four-year colleges. On the other hand, the absence of such policies may decrease transfer opportunities to the more prestigious public universities which can be more selective due to increased demand from highly qualified high school seniors. In California, for instance, the absence of a policy guaranteeing admission to community college graduates to the state's senior institutions has less of an implication for transfer opportunities to the state's four-year colleges than for the state's university system. That is, a student who graduates from a Los Angeles community college is practically guaranteed admission to California State College at Los Angeles or Northridge but not to UCLA.

*A.A. degree considered as certification of completion of first-two years of college.* While only Maryland and CUNY have a guaranteed admission policy into senior public colleges for community college graduates, six states (Ohio, Massachusetts, Illinois, Florida, and Michigan) have guidelines or policies which define the associate of arts (A.A.) degree (in some cases also the associate of science) as certification that the holder has achieved junior status or has completed general education requirements for the baccalaureate.

A 1970 resolution adopted by the Illinois Board of Higher Education states that senior institutions should regard a student who has completed "an associate degree based on baccalaureate-oriented sequences be considered a) to have attained junior standing and b) to have met lower-division general education requirements of senior institutions." In Ohio, students who earn the associate of arts degree with a specified number of credits in English composition and literature, humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and/or natural sciences or mathematics are considered to have reached the "halfway point in the progression toward a baccalaureate degree" as long as the student has also completed programmatic pre-requisites (presumably in his/her intended major). The Commonwealth Transfer Compact in Massachusetts states that the associate degree "will be honored as a unit and construed as : (1) completion of at least 60 hours of work toward a baccalaureate degree, and (2) completion of at least 33 credit hours toward fulfillment of the general education requirements for the baccalaureate degree."

Florida requires that all public institutions (two-and four-year colleges) develop a general education program that involves at least 36 semester hours, and it specifies that students who have been certified by any public institution as having fulfilled general education requirements and who transfer to another institution will not be required to complete any additional lower division general education courses. Therefore, in Florida, community colleges can certify that their students have completed general education requirements and the senior colleges are required to honor their certification. Although Florida's articulation policies do not indicate whether a student who transfers after completing the associate of arts should be considered as having achieved junior status by the receiving institution, it can be safely assumed, given Florida's extensive provisions for interinstitutional articulation, that students who transfer with the associate of arts degree are granted junior status.

Although California has a state-level committee on articulation, it lacks all of the other provisions, mainly because it has never adopted a state policy on intersegmental articulation. Michigan does not have a statewide policy regulating articulation among public institutions, but it has the MACRAO agreement which was developed jointly by the state's major public and private institutions. In the absence of a statewide policy on articulation, this is a viable alternative and fulfills the same purpose as might be served by a formalized statement of policy. In fact, the MACRAO agreement in some respects is more comprehensive than some state-adopted policies and, perhaps, more effective because it represents a cooperative interinstitutional effort rather than a policy developed by a state regulatory agency.

In Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, and Alabama interinstitutional articulation is left up to individual institutions with little or no direction from state regulatory agencies. Individual articulation agreements for the UCCTOP colleges within these states were not reviewed; however, a cursory review of the colleges' catalogs revealed that they provide little or no information to potential transfer students on what types of agreements they have with four-year colleges and universities. As a matter of fact, in the overwhelming majority of the catalogs for the 24 UCCTOP colleges information on transfer opportunities and services cannot be found quickly by simply looking in either the table of contents or index under the descriptor "transfer." By and large, most of the colleges' catalogs only indicate that programs for which an associate of arts degree is offered will make a student eligible for transfer to a senior institution. Even though many of the colleges have articulation agreements with senior institutions in areas such as engineering, nursing, business administration, or computer science, descriptions of these programs rarely can be found in catalogs. Presumably, students are made aware of these programmatic alternatives by their counselors.

Among the eight California UCCTOP colleges, all of the colleges that are part of the Los Angeles Community College District (Harbor, Mission, West Los Angeles, and Los Angeles City) have course catalogs that designate for each course whether it is transferable to the University of California or California State University College system; Sacramento City College also includes similar kinds of information in its catalog. Neither San Diego City College, Laney, or Compton provide comparable information. In addition to coding courses according to their transferability to the UC or CSUC systems, some of the California community colleges have initiated articulation agreements in special areas; these, however, are mostly with the senior colleges of the CSUC system rather than with the more prestigious campuses of the University of California system, i.e., Berkeley and UCLA.

# CHAPTER FIVE:

# THE FACULTY

A survey instrument was developed to gather general demographic characteristics of a representative sample of faculty primarily teaching college and university parallel courses (courses eligible for transfer credit to a senior institution). The survey form was a modified version of the forms administered in earlier Center studies of the faculty in community colleges nationwide,as reported in Cohen and Brawer 1977, and Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984.

The survey also included questions on frequency of faculty interaction with students in formal and informal settings; frequency of faculty participation in transfer-related activities; comparability of course requirements with equivalent courses offered in senior institutions; and a measurement of faculty attitudes on a variety of aspects underlying the transfer functidon in community colleges.

The sample included 444 faculty members from the 24 colleges participating in UCCTOP, which is approximately five percent of the total full- and part-time faculty employed by the colleges in 1983 (see Table 15). Of the 444 surveys distributed, usable responses were returned from 347 individuals for a total return rate of 78 percent.

## Table 15

### Total faculty and percentage of full-time faculty in UCCTOP Colleges

| UCCTOP Colleges | Total Faculty | Percentage of Full-Time Faculty |
|---|---|---|
| Lawson (AL) | 92 | 78 |
| South Mountain (AZ) | 123 | 17 |
| Compton (CA) | 98 | 82 |
| L.A. City (CA) | 488 | 68 |
| L.A. Harbor (CA) | 301 | 68 |
| L.A. Mission (CA) | 109 | 63 |
| West Los Angeles (CA) | 295 | 51 |
| Sacramento (CA) | 448 | 55 |
| Laney College (CA) | 382 | 50 |
| San Diego (CA) | 543 | 27 |
| Miami-Dade (FL) | 623 | 48 |
| Honolulu (HW) | 200 | 55 |
| State CC of East St. Louis* (MO) | 74 | 63 |
| Jefferson (KY) | 363 | 39 |
| CC of Baltimore (MY) | 503 | 29 |
| Roxbury (MA) | 83 | 64 |
| Highland Park (MI) | 139 | 35 |
| Bronx (NY) | 436 | 58 |
| La Guardia* (NY) | 573 | 40 |
| Hostos* (NY) | 266 | 41 |
| Cuyahoga (OH) | 449 | 37 |
| CC of Philadelphia (PA) | 742 | 45 |
| Houston CC System* (TX) | 1336 | 24 |
| J. Sergeant Reynolds (VA) | 471 | 34 |
| Group Average | 381 | 49 |

* Data on faculty were gathered from the 1983 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory; non-starred institutions provided the data in their 1983 Phase I application to the Ford Foundation.

### Sample selection

An approximate total number of courses offered was derived by adding the colleges' October 1982 headcount enrollment and dividing by 32 (an estimate of average class size). Based on this total, we decided that taking every twentieth eligible course section from the Spring 1984 class schedule would guarantee an adequate sample size. To avoid order bias, courses were randomly determined for each schedule. Special care was taken to avoid selecting courses taught by the same instructor. Only courses with academic transfer credit were eligible for selection (e.g., English 101, Math 104, General Engineering 2, etc.).

### Sample Characteristics

Discipline area or field. Table 16 shows the distribution of the faculty sample by discipline areas. The majority of the sampled faculty teach courses in humanities (31.4%) and social sciences (17.6%); less than one-third (30%) teach courses in professional areas, i.e., business administration, nursing.

Table 16

Sampled faculty by discipline area and field

| Discipline | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Physical Sciences | 47 | 13.5 |
| Biological Sciences | 17 | 4.9 |
| Humanities | 109 | 31.4 |
| Social Sciences | 61 | 17.6 |
| Professional Fields | 103 | 29.7 |
| Not reported | 10 | 2.9 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

Course level. The faculty was asked to indicate whether the course level was remedial, introductory, or intermediate. Since the sample drawn was limited to transfer eligible courses, it was not surprising that only three percent were classified as remedial. Slightly over two-thirds of the courses taught by the sampled faculty fell into the introductory level compared to 28 percent that were classified as intermediate or sophomore level courses. Table 17 provides the distribution of the sample by course level taught.

Table 17

Sampled faculty by course level

| Course Level | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Remedial | 9 | 2.6 |
| Introductory | 231 | 66.6 |
| Intermediate | 98 | 28.2 |
| Not reported | 9 | 2.6 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

Age, sex, and ethnicity. Tables 18, 19, and 20 show the distribution of the sampled faculty on three variables: age, sex, and racial/ethnic category. The greatest concentration of individuals (114) is in the 36-45 years old category, followed closely by the 46-55 years old category (100) and the 56 and older category (80). With regard to sex and ethnicity, the sample is predominantly male (69%) and white (62%). The representation of black and Hispanic faculty is approximately equal, 10 and 11 percent respectively.

## Table 18

## Sampled faculty by age

| Age | Number of Respondents | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| 35 years old and under | 38 | 11.0 |
| 36-45 years old | 114 | 32.9 |
| 46-55 years old | 100 | 28.8 |
| 56 and older | 80 | 23.1 |
| Not reported | 15 | 4.3 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

## Table 19

## Sampled faculty by sex

| Sex | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 240 | 69.2 |
| Female | 101 | 29.1 |
| Not reported | 6 | 1.7 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

Table 20

Sampled faculty by racial/ethnic category

| Groups | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Black | 33 | 9.5 |
| Hispanic | 37 | 10.7 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 16 | 4.6 |
| White | 214 | 61.7 |
| Other | 26 | 7.5 |
| Not reported | 21 | 6.1 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

These demographic data indicate that the UCCTOP college faculty are older than the community college faculty nationwide: the Center's 1983 survey found only 19 percent aged 56 or older, whereas 15 percent were 35 or younger. The male-female ratio was the same but the ethnic composition of the faculty differed notably; nationwide, 87 percent of the faculty are white.

Employment status and number of years teaching. Almost three-fourths of the sampled faculty have full-time appointments at the UCCTOP colleges. Slightly less than half of the respondents have held their present teaching positions between one and ten years and 38 percent have been on the faculty from 11 to 20 years; nationwide, 48 percent have held their position for between 11 and 20 years.

Table 21

Sampled faculty by employment status

| Employment Status | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Full-Time | 257 | 74.1 |
| Part-Time | 80 | 23.1 |
| Not reported | 10 | 2.9 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

Table 22

Sampled faculty by number of years taught at UCCTOP college

| Years Teaching at College | Number of Respondents | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| 1-5 years | 93 | 26.8 |
| 6-10 years | 70 | 20.2 |
| 11-20 years | 133 | 38.3 |
| More than 20 years | 26 | 7.0 |
| Not reported | 25 | 7.0 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

Highest degree held. The masters was the highest degree held by the majority (64%) of the faculty respondents. The proportion holding the doctorate (21%) is slightly lower than the national average for two-year college faculty (Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984, p.10).

Table 23

Sampled faculty by highest degree held

| Highest Degree Held | Number | Percentage of Total Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Associate | 5 | 1.4 |
| Bachelor | 35 | 10.1 |
| Master | 222 | 64.0 |
| Doctorate | 74 | 21.3 |
| None | 3 | 0.9 |
| Not reported | 8 | 2.3 |
| TOTAL | 347 | 100.0 |

## Faculty Awareness of Student Characteristics

Four questions in the survey explore the type of information faculty have about their students on education and career expectations, academic background, and employment. Although almost half of the respondents indicated that they were aware of their students' degree plans (Table 24), the majority did not have information on student transfer aspirations (67%), performance on basic skills tests (81%), and employment status (80%). Among faculty teaching intermediate courses, 65 percent indicated awareness of their students's degree plans in contrast to 47 percent among faculty teaching introductory courses.

It was expected that since the faculty are teaching prerequisite courses for transfer to senior institutions that there would be greater awareness about student transfer aspirations. Also, since large numbers of students enrolled in their courses may not have qualified for admission to four-year colleges due to deficiencies in their academic background, it was assumed that the faculty would have information on a student's basic skills performance that could be used to structure course content to address basic skills development. Finally, much of the literature on community colleges emphasizes that one of their strengths is a high level of concern for individual needs within a nurturing environment. An essential condition to a student-centered environment -- faculty awareness of individual needs -- is not demonstrated in the data reported.

A recent statement made by the Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College district emphasized the importance of re-establishing the role of faculty as advisor as well as providing faculty with more information on students (Koltai, 1981). This statement indicates that developing faculty understanding of their students demands greater attention from institutional leaders. For faculty to be well informed about student characteristics, college administrators will have to develop procedures to share with them basic information gathered from entry basic skills tests and student admission applications.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 24

Faculty responses to questions on student background information

| Items | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Student scores on basic skills test (n: 320) | 19.4% | 80.6% |
| Student degree aspirations (n: 333) | 51.7 | 48.3 |
| Number of students planning to transfer (n: 321) | 32.7 | 67.3 |
| Number of hours employed (n: 322) | 20.5 | 79.5 |

## Faculty Interaction with Students

Several items were included in the questionnaire to explore the type and degree of contact faculty have with students. Faculty responses to these items have been organized into formal and informal contact in Tables 25 and 26.

Formal faculty-student interaction. The data for the three items related to formal faculty-student interaction show that a high proportion of the faculty report meeting with students frequently during office hours (62%) and about half (51%) of the respondents reported they frequently advise students on course selection prior to registration. On the other hand, a small minority of the faculty appear to be actively involved (14%) in orientation activities for new students. Limited faculty participation in student orientation sessions may be attributable to a reduction (or non-existence) of formal orientation programs in community colleges. For instance, in a case study of an urban community college, the authors reported that according to students and faculty, orientation sessions are not considered an institutional priority (Richardson, Fisk, and Okun, 1983). Moreover, orientation sessions may be used more as a vehicle for efficiently registering and testing students rather than a way of creating a sense of belongingness and institutional identification.

Information giving is one function served by orientation sessions; however, they can serve other, more intrinsically important purposes. Activities could be structured to stimulate student involvement in the academic and social environment of the institution; to instill a sense of institutional identification; and to lessen isolation, particularly at the point of entry when students find themselves in a new and alien environment. Moreover, if students sense an unwelcome or indifferent feeling in their initial contact with the institution, they may respond similarly towards the institution and to the role of student. Well-organized orientation sessions could represent a resource that community colleges may not be exploiting as fully as they might to achieve greater institutional and student integration.

Table 25

Formal faculty-student interaction

| Items | Frequently | Occasionally | Never |
|---|---|---|---|
| Meet students during office hours (n: 342) | 61.7% | 31.0% | 7.3% |
| Advise students on course selection (n: 341) | 50.4 | 39.6 | 10.0 |
| Participate in orientation session for new students (n: 336) | 14.3 | 32.7 | 53.0 |
| Discuss student applications for transfer to four-year colleges (n: 341) | 27.3 | 59.2 | 13.5 |

A low proportion of faculty reported frequently meeting with students to discuss applications for transfer to four-year colleges. This may be an indication that faculty are marginally involved with the supportive aspects of the transfer process. Indeed, among the students sampled, only 37 percent indicated that their instructors had played an important role in providing information regarding transfer opportunities to four-year colleges.

Informal faculty-student interaction. The data presented in Table 25 show that only a very small proportion of faculty interact with students in settings other than the classroom or the instructor's office. For instance, only seven percent of the faculty reported frequently meeting with students for lunch/coffee and only three percent reported frequently inviting students to their homes. Informal interaction between faculty and students was more likely to take place through structured activities, i.e., advising on personal problems, and through invitations to attend on-campus activities; however, the proportion of faculty reporting frequent participation in such activities did not exceed one-third of the total sample.

Table 26

Informal faculty-student interaction

| Items | Frequently | Occasionally | Never |
|---|---|---|---|
| Have coffee or lunch with students (n: 331) | 6.9% | 52.0% | 41.1% |
| Invite students to your home (n: 330) | 2.7 | 19.4 | 77.9 |
| Lend books to students (n: 342) | 21.6 | 65.8 | 12.6 |
| Advise students on personal problems (n: 338) | 24.6 | 59.5 | 16.0 |
| Invite students to attend cultural or other on-campus activities (n: 347) | 33.9 | 46.5 | 19.6 |

## Preparing Students for the Academic Environment of Senior Colleges

Assessment of student performance. "Transfer shock" is a common phenomenon among students transferring from community colleges to senior institutions. Differences in academic rigor as well as in the methods used to assess student learning appear to be the most important causes for the incidence of transfer shock. In general, senior college faculty are more likely to assign a greater quantity of reading assignments and use written assignments as a basis for evaluating student performance (Smith, 1983; Alba and Lavin, 1981; Cardinal, 1981).

To explore the extent to which the surveyed faculty relies on objective forced-choiced tests versus written assignments or essay exams as a method of assessing student learning, they were asked to indicate how much weight was given to four possible alternative evaluation measures to determine final grades.

Table 27

Evaluation of student performance

| Type of Requirement | Not included in final grade | 25% or less of final grade | More than 25% of final grade |
|---|---|---|---|
| Papers written outside class (n: 292) | 39.0% | 38.0% | 22.9% |
| Papers written in class (n: 253) | 61.7 | 20.6 | 17.8 |
| Quick-score/objective tests (n: 302) | 25.2 | 22.8 | 52.0 |
| Essay exams (n: 263) | 45.2 | 28.1 | 26.6 |

More than half of the faculty (52%) indicated that one-fourth or more of a student's final grade is based on performance in quick-score/objective tests. In contrast, only 27 percent of the faculty indicated essay tests as representing more than 25 percent of a student's final grade. Moreover, while only 25 percent of the faculty reported that quick-score/objective tests were not used to determine a student's final grade, 45 percent reported not using essay exams as part of the final grade. Notably, 70 percent of the faculty reporting that more than 25 percent of the final grade was based on essay exams were teaching courses in liberal arts subjects rather than in professional fields.

These questions regarding classroom practices were asked also of nationwide samples of liberal arts instructors in 1977 and again in 1983. The UCCTOP college sample was less likely to rely on papers written outside class, more likely to use papers written in class as aids in determining student grades. The UCCTOP college faculty tended more toward using quick score/objective tests; when compared with the national samples, only half as many of them used essay exams (Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984, p. 32).

Community-senior college course equivalency. Establishing comparability between transfer prerequisite courses at the sending community college with equivalent courses at the receiving senior institution depends largely on faculty inititative, particularly in those colleges which lack formal course articulation agreements with senior colleges. Results from the survey reveal that in the last five years a large proportion of the respondents have engaged in a variety of activities to achieve comparability in format, content, and requirements in equivalent community and senior college courses. Furthermore, 43 percent of the respondents indicated that course content is influenced a great deal by what is taught in senior colleges.

Table 28

Faculty initiatives to establish equivalency between community-senior college courses

| Activity | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Compared community college course syllabus with the syllabus of equivalent senior college courses (n: 334) | 67.4% | 32.6% |
| Compared the textbooks for this course with those used in equivalent senior college courses (n: 335) | 83.0 | 17.0 |
| Compared the exams given in this course with those given in equivalent senior college courses (n: 326) | 45.1 | 54.9 |
| Compared the assignments required for this course with those given in equivalent senior college courses (n: 339) | 59.9 | 40.1 |

Of the four activities listed, the only one in which less than half of the respondents reported involvement was that of determining comparability in the type of exams given in equivalent senior college courses. On the basis of these results it would appear that faculty place greater emphasis on transferable content than on transferable skills.

## Faculty Involvement in Transfer-Related Activities

In the last three years, seventy-nine percent of the faculty reported they have not been involved in organizing student visits to four-year colleges; 75 percent have not served on committees to develop articulation agreements with four-year colleges; and 83 percent have not invited a member of the faculty of a senior college to speak about transfer opportunities to their students.

Even though the faculty seem to be involved in a very limited way in formal activities designed to stimulate student interest in transfer opportunities or to facilitate the process of transfer, they seem to be more actively involved in other aspects of the transfer process. For instance, 78 percent of the respondents indicated having written at least once during the last three years a letter of recommendation in support of student transfer applications; and 49 percent reported having followed-up on individual students who transfered to senior colleges. However, actual faculty involvement in formal and informal aspects of the transfer process is the exception rather than the norm.

## Faculty Attitudes Towards the Transfer Function

Responses on selected items demonstrating faculty attitudes towards the transfer function in contrast to other community college functions are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Faculty responses to selected transfer function attitudinal items

| Items | Faculty Responses in Percentages | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Agreement | Neutral | Disagreement |
| 1. The primary function of the community college should be to prepare students for transfer to four-year colleges or universities. (n: 339) | 19.2 | 22.7 | 58.1 |
| 2. First-time freshmen in community colleges should be encouraged to earn, at the very least, the baccalaureate degree. (n: 338) | 34.1 | 29.0 | 38.0 |
| 3. Transfer education should be this college's most important function. (n: 340) | 15.6 | 20.3 | 64.1 |
| 4. Community colleges that place too much emphasis on the transfer program create unrealistic expectations for their students. (n: 341) | 35.8 | 18.2 | 46.0 |
| 5. The best indicator of a community college's effectiveness is the proportion of its freshmen who go on to earn a baccalaureate. (n: 342) | 18.7 | 20.2 | 61.1 |
| 6. Community college students will feel a greater sense of accomplishment if they earn a baccalaureate degree. (n: 340) | 53.2 | 28.5 | 18.2 |

Table 29

(continued)

| Items | Faculty Responses in Percentages | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Agreement | Neutral | Disagreement |
| 7. A community college that emphasizes transfer education will lose community support. (n: 341) | 6.5 | 11.4 | 82.1 |
| 8. To strengthen the transfer function, community colleges would have to de-emphasize some of their other functions. (n: 341) | 22.0 | 13.5 | 64.5 |
| 9. The expansion of community and continuing education programs threatens the vitality of the transfer function. (n: 339) | 8.6 | 14.7 | 76.7 |
| 10. Excessive emphasis on community service education downgrades the transfer function of the community college. (n: 339) | 30.4 | 23.6 | 46.0 |
| 11. Community education enhances the transfer function because it attracts more students to the college. (n: 340) | 60.2 | 25.0 | 13.8 |

Contrary to our expectations, the attitudes held by the majority of the faculty respondents do not represent a strong mandate for increased attention to transfer education. Despite agreement from more than half of the faculty sample that students will have a greater sense of accomplishment if they earn the baccalaureate degree, less than one-fifth of the respondents agreed that the primary function of the community college should be that of preparing students for transfer to senior institutions. Additionally, only 17 percent agreed that transfer education should be the colleges most important function; and only 19 percent agreed that the best indicator of a community college's effectiveness is the proportion of its freshmen who go on to earn the baccalaureate. Moreover, only 22 percent agreed that to strengthen the transfer function, community colleges would have to de-emphasize some of their other functions. Evidently, the majority of the faculty share the philosophy espoused by advocates of the community college movement -- a philosophy grounded on the belief that the character of the colleges precludes programmatic priorities as well as measures of effectiveness based on graduation and transfer rates.

Faculty who agreed that the primary function of the community college should be to prepare students for transfer (item 1, Table 29) differed in their attitudes from respondents who disagreed: they were more likely to agree that first-time freshmen should be encouraged to earn the baccalaureate (63% versus 25%); almost three-fourths (74% versus 38%) disagreed that placing too much emphasis on the transfer program may create unrealistic expectations for their students; seventy-nine percent (compared to 46%) agreed that community college students will feel a greater sense of accomplishment if they earn a baccalaureate degree; and more than half (53% versus 10%) agreed that the best indicator of a community college's effectiveness is the proportion of its freshmen who go on to earn a baccalaureate.

While the questionnaire to students did not include the same questions posed in the faculty questionnaire, their response to one item relating to the importance given to transfer education indicated important attitudinal differences between faculty and students. Fifty-three percent of the sampled students agreed with the statement that "increasing the number of students who transfer to four-year colleges should be one of the top priorities of the college."

An even greater gap exists between faculty attitudes about transfer education and student stated aspirations. This is reflected in the former group's response to whether freshmen in community colleges should be encouraged to earn the baccalaureate degree and the latter group's response to a question on what is the highest degree they plan on earning. While only 34 percent of the faculty agreed that community college freshmen should be encouraged to earn the baccalaureate, 74 percent of the sampled students indicated they plan on earning a B.A. or higher degree. The faculty's response may indicate that they are not fully aware of student aspirations. A more plausible explanation, however, considering that 36 percent of the faculty agreed that too much emphasis on transfer education creates unrealistic expectations for their students, is that faculty in general may not perceive the stated aspirations of students as an accurate reflection of transfer likelihood. Congruency between student aspirations and attitudes on the one hand, and actual behaviors on the other, is discussed extensively in the next section.

Despite the possibility that faculty attitudes towards transfer education may represent a more pragmatic outlook than is reflected in student aspirations, there is nonetheless a disturbing element in the findings. What appear to be missing among the majority of the faculty respondents are commitment and belief in the critical role urban community colleges fulfill as transfer institutions, particularly for minority students. The faculty responses could be interpreted as widespread acceptance of the normative egalitarian image of community colleges. That is, as comprehensive institutions serving several competing functions, none of which ought to merit greater attention. However, upon further examination of other questionnaire items, it could be speculated that faculty might perceive other community college functions -- life-long learning and occupational education -- as options more viable for the continued survival of their institutions than transfer education. The faculty's responses to these items, presented in Table 30, indicate that given the choice of what functions should be given greater emphasis, they are more apt to choose functions that are more marketable and offer greater opportunities for program expansion.

## Faculty Attitudes Towards Community College Functions

The high proportion of faculty (60%) agreeing with the statement that community education enhances transfer education because more students are attracted to the college (item 11, Table 29) as well as agreement from 68 percent of the faculty that in order to attract students, occupational/vocational programs have to be expanded (item 3, Table 30) imply concern with institutional survival. From the vantage point of the faculty, adaptation in a turbulent environment might be more easily secured through growth in programs with greater market visibility. Transfer education, on the other hand, is a more risky venture: the clientele is ill-prepared, a large number are not fully committed to their stated aspirations, retention is low, and the process of preparing students for transfer is lengthy and complex. Consequently, faculty may be reluctant to support any suggestion implying increased priority and resources to a function in which community colleges have proven to be marginally successful.

## Table 30

### Faculty attitudes to non-transfer related functions

| Items | Faculty Responses in Percentages | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Agreement | Neutral | Disagreement |
| 1. The primary function of the community college should be life-long education. (n: 359) | 50.1 | 25.4 | 24.5 |
| 2. The community expects its community college to prepare people for immediate employment. (n: 339) | 40.5 | 23.3 | 36.3 |
| 3. To attract students, community colleges have to expand occupational/vocational programs in high demand areas. (n: 342) | 68.1 | 15.2 | 16.7 |

## Summary Discussion

The data collected for a random sample of the UCCTOP faculty provide a general profile of instructors teaching courses in the transfer curriculum. The primary purpose of the survey was to assess the faculty's contribution towards support and maintenance goals of the transfer function, goals that could be said to constitute all those institutional processes that shape an institutional environment particularly adaptable to the transfer mission. Some of the processes may be formal; for instance, the use of prescribed procedures to identify potential transfer students in order to assist them in planning an academic program that is transferable to a senior institution. Others may be more informal in that they are not clearly defined or connected, yet they are nevertheless present because the institution places a high priority on the transfer mission. For example, creating opportunities to foster a commitment to learning.

There are at least two ways in which faculty contribute to the processes associated with support and maintenance goals of the transfer function. First, in their teaching role they assume the responsibility for the academic development of students who hope to transfer to senior institutions. This requires that faculty besides transmitting knowledge, also be sensitive to equipping students with the skills needed to compete effectively in the academic environments of senior colleges.

Our data show that a large proportion of the faculty have compared course content (syllabi and textbooks) with equivalent senior college courses. On the other hand, a smaller proportion have attempted to determine comparability of course requirements (exams and assignments), which may indicate that more emphasis is placed on content comparability rather than rigor. This interpretation of our findings, even though speculative in nature, is reinforced by our finding that the prevalent method of assessing student learning is through objective tests, rather than writing requirements.

While we have no data to compare whether senior college students are required during their first two years of college to do more writing than students in community colleges, the development of writing skills is likely to be far more critical for the community college student. Numerous students who begin their education in a community college and have transfer aspirations have academic deficiencies which precluded them from being admitted directly to four-year colleges. The community college is expected to remediate academic deficiencies as well as prepare the students to qualify, at least ideally, for junior status at the senior college. Consequently, it would seem logical that to ensure a smooth transition from community to senior colleges, course requirements in the transfer curriculum should be at the very least as rigorous as in senior colleges.

The second possible way in which faculty can contribute to the support and maintenance goals of the transfer function is less easily definable for it encompasses a variety of things, some of which are associated with but not directly related to teaching functions, while others are a reflection of faculty attitudes and commitment as exemplified in actions, beliefs, or values. Faculty also engage in other formal student-centered activities; they advise students with course selection, and meet students during office hours to discuss assignments or suggest ways of improving performance. Our findings suggest that half or more of the faculty are involved in these type of activities, which is not unusual since in most institutions faculty are expected to commit a certain amount of time to office hours. In contrast, inactivity appears to prevail with regard to involvement in voluntary type of activities, of both a formal and informal nature. For example, the proportion of faculty reporting frequent participation in orientation sessions for new students or frequently advising students with personal problems was quite small. Additionally, a small proportion reported having served during the last three years on interinstitutional articulation committees, which is also likely to be a voluntary activity.

Little or no faculty participation in activities that increase their interaction with students and with other domains of the institution may indicate that faculty influence vis-a-vis the transfer mission does not extend beyond the boundaries of the transfer curriculum. Exposing students to a sequence of transferable courses alone is unlikely to increase the transfer chances of the typical student in a UCCTOP college. The typical UCCTOP student, as we show in the next section, in spite of aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree, does not exhibit attitudes and behaviors underlying transfer predisposition. These students need to be exposed to an environment that is supportive of their high degree aspirations, one which helps them translate their aspirations into a commitment that is more tangible and enduring.

The faculty represent one of the most valuable resources the colleges can marshall in support of the transfer function. Faculty, more than anyone else in the institution, have more frequent and more consistent contact with students and therefore have the greatest opportunity to influence student aspirations. The student who begins education in a community college with unclear educational goals, uncertain of his potential, and unsure of what is to be gained from a college education, is particularly vulnerable to faculty actions that unintentionally could either buttress or undermine transfer aspirations.

While we believe that faculty could make an important contribution towards the support and maintenance goals of the transfer function, the data presented, although admittedly incomplete, do not provide convincing evidence that the faculty are in fact making a major contribution. Two reasons that might explain why this might be are: (1) that transfer education is perceived as the exclusive domain of administrative personnel, specifically in areas of student services and (2) that transfer education has become a secondary function.

Although our survey did not attempt to establish whether faculty perceive transfer education as being primarily an administrative function controlled by student services personnel, there are several indications that this may in fact be the case. A review of the programs developed by the 24 UCCTOP colleges receiving grants from the Ford Foundation to strengthen transfer education revealed that the predominant strategy used by the majority of colleges revolved around counseling and information services or activities designed to improve course transferability either through curricular revisions or formal articulation agreements with receiving senior institutions. The colleges that incorporated faculty into their programmatic designs were the exception rather than the norm. Moreover, of the twenty-four projects, only one was developed and directed by a faculty team. The other 23 projects were under the direction of individuals whose primary responsibilities were administrative -- deans of student services, grant development officers, deans of instruction, and counselors.

The consequences of administrative dominance of the transfer function may be an overemphasis on the procedural and instrumental aspects associated with upward transfer, rather than on environmental aspects related to quality in the academic and social domains. The stress on the procedural aspects is understandable for it involves processes that are recognizable and can be specified in rational terms; they are also more quantifiable and therefore more easily measurable. In other words, procedural aspects are particularly adaptable to rational planning processes.

Conversely, the processes needed to bring about qualitative changes in the institution's academic and social climates are not so easily definable; moreover, they are not so much the product of a plan but rather the elaboration of norms, values, and beliefs underlying the transfer mission. It could be said, then, that from a procedural perspective the focus is on task, whereas from a qualitative perspective the focus is on institutional climate. Although the procedural and qualitative aspects of the transfer function are not independent from one another and demand the joint efforts of administrators and faculty, it may be that the procedural aspects can be more appropriately addressed by administrative personnel, and the qualitative aspects by faculty.

The sizable enrollment of first-time college students from minority backgrounds who aspire to the baccalaureate imposes a special responsibility upon these UCCTOP colleges to single out transfer education as an institutional priority. Our data, however, show that the majority of the faculty do not agree that the colleges' primary or most important function should be transfer education. There was substantial faculty consensus that life-long education should be the primary function of the community college and more than two-thirds of the faculty expressed agreement with the need to expand occupational/vocational programs in order to attract students.

The faculty responses were puzzling; it was expected that since the sample included only instructors teaching transferable courses that their responses would represent a strong mandate for transfer education. As already pointed out, the faculty responses appear to reflect a concern with attracting and maintaining resources. In many community colleges this concern has been addressed through an expansion of programs in community education, targeted at the non-traditional adult student market concomitant with a reduction of emphasis on the traditional collegiate function. The noted absence of faculty contribution towards the advancement of transfer-related goals may be a manifestation of faculty awareness that in light of new institutional priorities such efforts are not only of limited value, but also contradict institutional priorities.

The purpose of the UCCTOP was to strengthen transfer education in selected urban community colleges, both by providing grants that would enable the colleges to develop intervention strategies and also to bring national attention to a problem that has serious implications for minority access to higher education. The potential impact the programs can have in each of the UCCTOP colleges as well as in the universe of urban community colleges may not be fully realized unless the UCCTOP leadership convey to their college communities that transfer education is indeed an institutional priority. The brief profile of the UCCTOP faculty suggests that a reaffirmation of institutional commitment to transfer education is imperative.

In the next section, several of the issues raised here are re-examined and expanded on from the perspective of the UCCTOP students.

# CHAPTER SIX:

# THE STUDENTS

Nationwide, over 75 percent of full-time community college freshmen claim that they plan on earning a baccalaureate or higher degree; however, follow-up studies at the national level have revealed that nine years after enrolling in a community college, less than 25 percent achieve their initial aspirations (Astin, 1983). In some states, annual transfer rates represent only three to five percent of the total enrollment in community colleges (Lombardi, 1979). Recent statistics from the state of California, which has the largest community college system in the country, revealed that transfers from its eighteen community college districts to the state's four-year college and university systems constituted three percent of their total enrollment (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1984). However, that percentage is quite misleading because the total enrollment figure includes people who already have degrees, those enrolled in courses only for their personl interest, and so on.

The disparity between the initial degree aspirations of community college students and actual outcomes is an issue of increasing concern to policymakers, institutional leaders, and other interest groups because community colleges are the main entry point for many students into higher education, particularly minority and low-income students. Among Hispanic and American Indian students in institutions of higher education, 53 percent are enrolled in community colleges; for blacks, the figure is somewhat lower, 39.3 percent;

and for whites, it is 32.2 percent (NCES, 1984). Few minority students who start out their education in community colleges go on to earn the baccalaureate degree. After attending a community college for two years, 26 percent of whites, compared to 18 percent of blacks and nine percent of Hispanics transferred to a senior institution (NCES, 1977).

A major goal of this study was to explore individual student characteristics, as well as patterns of student involvement in the academic and social domains of the institutions that might be indicative of a predisposition to transfer. More specifically, we were interested in learning the strength of relationship between student aspirations for a baccalaureate degree and student behaviors demonstrating active intent to complete the degree.

A second question of interest was to determine the correlates of transfer attitudes and behaviors. That is, what are the most important student characteristics and institutional experiences to which high transfer attitudes and behaviors might be attributed?

The student data are organized into three major sections. The first section provides a general overview of the responses provided by the sampled students to the questionnaire items. The second section examines differences in student transfer predisposition. The last section provides a brief look at student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function.

## Sample Selection

A questionnaire with item sets designed to measure individual demographic and background characteristics (e.g., race, sex, high school academic performance, socioeconomic status), attitudes and behaviors exemplifying commitment to the goal of upward transfer (e.g., educational and occupational aspirations, active involvement in seeking information on transfer opportunities, evidence of academic planning in anticipation of upward transfer), and involvement in the academic and social domains of the institution (e.g., study habits, college grades, interaction with faculty, use of institutional resources) was constructed for administration to a sample of students enrolled in the 24 UCCTOP colleges.

Using the Spring 1984 course schedule, 112 course sections identified as eligible for transfer credit to a four-year college were randomly selected for administration of the student questionnaire. The class section was used as the unit of sampling even though the student is the unit of analysis. This approach was the most feasible way of administering the questionnaire and does achieve a random sample of students enrolled in transfer courses. Similar sample selection had been used successfully in several prior Center projects.

The questionnaires were administered during the Spring 1984 semester, from April through June. The 24 colleges supplied enrollment figures for each targeted class section so that an appropriate number of questionnaires could be sent to each institution for administration. A total of 2,957 student questionnaires were mailed, of which 1,750 usable questionnaires were returned (58%). Some of these, however, were responses from students who had already earned a bachelor's or higher degree, and who therefore would not be in a community college preparing to transfer to a four-year college. These students were therefore removed from the sample, leaving the data from 1,613 students for subsequent analysis.

### Sample Characteristics

Of the total sample (1,613 students), 56 percent were females, which is about four percentage points higher than the proportion of women enrolled in all types of public institutions at all levels. Students from minority backgrounds also make up a large proportion of the sample. Table 31 shows that minorities as a combined category of all ethnic racial groups account for 64 percent of the total sample. Blacks represent slightly more than half of the total minority sample (33%); Hispanics account for 17 percent of the minority sample and Asians for 12 percent.

The majority of the sampled students (63%) are 25 years old or younger; the average age for the sample is 26 years old. More than one-third of the sampled students come from families with annual incomes of $10,999 or under.

Slightly more than one-third of the students are unemployed (34%); 21 percent hold part-time jobs (20 or less hours per week); and 45.2 percent work between 21 and 40 or more hours per week. In looking at employment patterns across ethnic groups, it became clear that blacks tend to be overrepresented among the unemployed and full-time job holders. While blacks account for 33% of the total sample, 42% of all unemployed students are black. Of the students who work more than 40 weekly hours 31% are black. See table 4 for the distribution of minorities by employment status.

Table 31

Students by racial/ethnic background

| Groups | Number | Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian/Alaskan | 39 | 2.5 |
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 179 | 11.5 |
| Filipino | 41 | 2.6 |
| Black | 515 | 33.1 |
| Chicano | 59 | 3.8 |
| Cuban | 50 | 3.2 |
| Puerto Rican | 44 | 2.8 |
| Other Hispanic | 112 | 7.2 |
| White | 437 | 28.1 |
| Other | 81 | 5.2 |
| Not Reported | 56 | --- |
| TOTAL | 1613 | 100.0 |

NOTE: In this table, figures for Hispanic students are reported separately for each subgroup; however, in the data analyses presented in the remainder of this report the Hispanic subgroups are combined and treated as a single category.

---

* Percentage calculated on number of actual respondents (1,557).

## Table 32

## Students by Income Levels

| Income Levels | Number | Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| $ 5,999 or under | 283 | 19.4 |
| $ 6,000 - 10,999 | 274 | 18.8 |
| $11,000 - 15,999 | 241 | 16.6 |
| $16,000 - 20,999 | 204 | 14.0 |
| $21,000 - 25,999 | 144 | 9.9 |
| $26,000 - 29,999 | 90 | 6.2 |
| $30,000 or higher | 220 | 15.1 |
| Not Reported | 157 | --- |
| TOTAL | 1613 | 100.0 |

* Percentages are calculated on the number of respondents who answered the item (1,456).

## Table 33

## Student Employment Status

| Hours Per Week Employed | Number | Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| None | 524 | 33.6 |
| 1 - 10 hours | 102 | 6.5 |
| 11 - 20 hours | 227 | 14.6 |
| 21 - 30 hours | 248 | 15.9 |
| 31 - 40 hours | 306 | 19.6 |
| 41 or more hours | 151 | 9.7 |
| Not Reported | 55 | --- |
| TOTAL | 1613 | 100.0 |

* Percentages are calculated on the number of repondents who answered the item (1,558).

Table 34

Employment status by ethnicity

| Employment Status | Ethnic Background | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Asian | Black | Hispanic | White |
| Unemployed | 18.3 | 41.9 | 16.3 | 23.4 |
| 1-20 weekly hours | | | | |
| 21-30 weekly hours | 13.4 | 29.3 | 23.3 | 34.1 |
| 31-40 weekly hours | 12.2 | 38.1 | 17.6 | 32.0 |
| Over 40 weekly hours | 9.0 | 30.6 | 20.9 | 39.6 |

## Educational Background Characteristics

The vast majority of students (85%) reported having earned a high school diploma. Ten percent of the sampled students indicated that their average grades in high school were A or A+; the proportion of students reporting average grades in college of A or A+ was slightly higher (13%). Overall, the distribution of school and college grades is fairly stable. One-fifth of the students reported having graduated in the top twentieth percentile of their high school graduating class. Table 35 presents data on the distribution of the sampled students by high school and college grades and Table 36 presents the sample distribution by rank in high school.

### Table 35

### High School and College Academic Performance in Percentages

| Grades | In High School | In College |
|---|---|---|
| A/A+ | 10.2 | 13.4 |
| B+ | 17.9 | 18.9 |
| B | 24.0 | 23.0 |
| B- | 13.7 | 12.4 |
| C+ | 16.6 | 16.2 |
| C | 10.8 | 10.4 |
| D | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Not Applicable | 5.2 | 4.5 |

### Table 36

### Distribution of Students by Rank in High School Graduating Class

| Rank | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Top 20th percentile | 303 | 18.8 |
| Second 20th percentile | 234 | 14.5 |
| Middle 20th percentile | 322 | 20.0 |
| Fourth 20th percentile | 67 | 4.2 |
| Bottom 20th percentile | 23 | 1.4 |
| Not Reported | 664 | 41.2 |
| TOTAL | 1613 | 100.0 |

## Attendance and Enrollment Status

Instead of asking students whether they attend college on a full- or part-time basis, they were asked to write the titles of courses in which they were enrolled in Spring 1984. Students who were enrolled in four or more courses were classified as full-time while those taking three or fewer courses were considered as part-time students. The distribution of the sample was remarkably even between the two groups: of the 1,426 students who provided responses, 49.1 and 50.9 were classified as part-time and full-time students respectively.

Because definitions of freshman and sophomore are not delineated as clearly in community colleges as in four-year colleges, students were asked instead to report the number of credits completed. Students who completed 29 or fewer credits, the equivalent of freshman status, comprise 48 percent of the sample; 51 percent of the students had completed 30 or more credits, the equivalent of sophomore status; and thirty-five students did not report the number of credits earned. The skewness of the sample towards advanced students was surprising since in most community colleges first-time students greatly outnumber sophomores. However, many of the units completed may have been in remedial and other classes not eligible for transfer credit.

The sampled students also reported the number of courses they have completed in English, humanities, science, social science, and mathematics. The results, shown in Table 37, reveal that the science area received the highest proportion of students (39%) having taken no courses, as well as the lowest proportion (19%) having taken three or more courses. Social sciences is the area with the highest proportion (36%) of students having taken three or more courses and English is the area with the lowest proportion (17%) of students reporting not having taken any courses.

Table 37

Number of Courses Completed in Arts and Science

| Course Areas | Number of Courses | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | None | One | Two | Three or more |
| English (n: 1547) | 16.6 | 23.7 | 29.8 | 29.9 |
| Humanities (n: 1538) | 33.4 | 24.8 | 20.2 | 21.7 |
| Science (n: 1526) | 39.0 | 24.0 | 18.1 | 18.9 |
| Math (n: 1548) | 22.6 | 26.9 | 20.6 | 29.6 |
| Social Sciences (n: 1559) | 20.2 | 22.6 | 21.0 | 36.2 |

## Educational Aspirations and Career Goals

In response to what is the highest degree they plan to obtain, almost three-fourths (74%) of the sampled students indicated the baccalaureate or higher degree. The most recent annual survey of full-time college freshmen reports that the proportion of community college students aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree is 78.5 percent (Astin and Others, 1984).

According to Astin (1983) initial degree aspiration among minority students has been found to be strongly related to retention, actual degree attainment, and entry into professional and graduate schools. Among minority students in the sample, the group with the highest proportion (76%) aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree are Asians; Hispanics have the lowest proportion of students (except for students classified as "other") aspiring to a B.A. (72%). Tables 38 and 39 present data on degree aspirations for the total sample and by racial/ethnic background.

Table 38

Degree Aspirations

| Degree | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Occupational Certificate | 14 | 1.0 |
| Associate | 229 | 16.6 |
| Bachelors | 579 | 42.0 |
| Graduate (MA/Ph.D) | 345 | 25.1 |
| Professional (law, medicine) | 98 | 7.1 |
| Undecided/None of the above | 112 | 8.1 |
| Not Reported | 236 | --- |

NOTE: Percentages are calculated on the number of respondents who answered the item (1,377).

Table 39

Degree Aspirations by Racial/Ethnic Background

| Groups | B.A. or higher | Less than B.A. |
|---|---|---|
| Asian (n: 149) | 75.8 | 24.2 |
| Black (n: 421) | 74.3 | 25.7 |
| Hispanic (n: 239) | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| White (n: 391) | 74.9 | 25.1 |
| Other (n: 134) | 70.9 | 29.1 |

Twenty-three percent of the sampled students indicated that they were planning a professional career requiring an advanced degree (e.g., engineering, law, medicine, business administration). The proportion of students indicating planning a career in the health professions (e.g., nursing, medical technician) and in technical fields (e.g., computer programmer, draftsman) was 16% in each of the areas. The sample distribution on career plans is shown in Table 40.

Table 40

Career Plans

| Career Areas | Number | Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Advanced Degree Professions | 355 | 23.1 |
| Allied Health | 244 | 15.9 |
| Applied Arts | 92 | 6.0 |
| Business Operations | 82 | 5.3 |
| Management and Sales | 121 | 7.9 |
| Social Science | 187 | 12.2 |
| Technologies | 249 | 16.2 |
| Trades and Crafts | 19 | 1.2 |
| Undecided | 71 | 4.6 |
| None of the Above | 117 | 7.6 |
| Not Reported | 76 | --- |

* Percentages are calculated on the number of respondents who answered the item (1,537).

## Primary Reason for Attending College

In addition to asking students about the highest degree they plan on obtaining, they were asked to select from among four possible choices the one reason which most closely reflected their primary reason for attending college. As shown in Table 41, 53% of the sampled students indicated preparing for transfer to a four-year college or university as their primary reason for attending college. Though considerably fewer students chose "to gain occupational skills" as their primary reason, the proportion (32%) was still fairly high.

It is very possible that students who plan on earning a B.A. degree may not choose preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college because they perceive the B.A. as a means of gaining occupational skills.

Table 41

Primary Reason for Attending College

| Items | Number | Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| Prepare for transfer to a four-year college/university | 802 | 53.1 |
| Gain occupational skills | 481 | 31.9 |
| Occupational advancement | 126 | 8.3 |
| Satisfy personal interest | 100 | 6.6 |
| Not Reported | 104 | --- |

* Percentages are calculated on the number of actual responses (1,509).

Table 42 shows the distribution of the sampled students by highest degree planned and the primary reason for attending college. As we suspected, a large proportion of students (56%) who indicated that their primary reason for attending college was "to gain occupational skills" also indicated planning on earning a B.A. or higher degree. While 53% and 56% respectively of students who chose as their primary reason for attending college either "to advance in their current occupation" or "to satisfy a personal interest" also indicated planning on a B.A. or higher degree, in absolute numbers they are considerably fewer than in the other two categories.

Table 42

Primary Reason for Attending College and Degree Aspirations

| Primary Reason for Attending College | Degree Aspirations | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | B.A. or higher | Less than B.A. | Undecided |
| Prepare for Transfer (n: 737) | 90.4 | 4.9 | 4.7 |
| Gain occupational skills (n: 422) | 55.9 | 35.1 | 9.0 |
| Occupational advancement (n: 120) | 52.5 | 35.8 | 11.7 |
| Satisfy personal interest (n: 85) | 56.5 | 18.8 | 24.7 |

The next step in the student data analysis was to examine students on the basis of their primary reason for attending college in relation to several dimensions: student demographic characteristics, participation in support services, and student involvement and commitment to learning. In particular, we were interested in exploring whether differences exist among students who chose "preparing for transfer as their primary reason" for attending college versus those who indicated other reasons.

## Primary Reason for Attending College and Student Characteristics

The data in Table 43 show marked differences in the primary reason for attending college across racial/ethnic groups. Asians have the highest proportion of students (70%) who chose preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college; the proportion of Hispanics choosing transfer as their primary reason for attending college was also fairly high (63%) in comparison to the other groups. Blacks were the group with the lowest proportion of students (45%) reporting transfer as their primary reason for attending college. In a study on Maryland's Community Colleges (Tschechtetlin, 1981), it was also reported that black students compared to whites have goals that are more career-oriented. In the findings reported here, however, it was found that the difference in transfer goals is more pronounced between blacks and other minority groups, than between black and white students.

Age, attendance status, sex, and number of credits completed were also found to be significantly related to student goals. Preparing for transfer is more likely to be given as a reason for attending college among students who are of traditional college age; among full-time students; and among males. Tables 44, 45, 46, and 47 present the sample's distribution on primary reason for attending college by age, attendance status, sex, and number of credits completed.

Table 43

Primary Reason for Attending College and Race/Ethnicity

| Groups | Primary Reason for Attending College<br>Transfer | Occupation Skills | Career Advancement | Personal Interest |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian/Pacific Islanders | 70.0 | 15.8 | 8.4 | 5.8 |
| Black | 44.7 | 38.5 | 11.4 | 5.4 |
| Hispanic | 62.8 | 28.9 | 5.8 | 3.4 |
| White | 47.9 | 31.0 | 10.8 | 10.2 |
| Other | 51.5 | 30.3 | 7.9 | 8.5 |

Table 44

Primary Reason for Attending College and Age

| Age | Primary Reason for Attending College<br>Transfer | Occupation Skills | Career Advancement | Personal Interest |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 - 22 years old | 60.5 | 30.7 | 4.8 | 3.9 |
| 23 - 25 years old | 53.9 | 32.3 | 7.8 | 6.0 |
| 26 - 40 years old | 46.3 | 33.4 | 12.2 | 8.0 |
| Over 40 years old | 16.3 | 26.1 | 32.6 | 25.0 |

## Table 45

### Primary Reason for Attending College and Attendance Status

| Attendance Status | Primary Reason for Attending College | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Transfer | Occupation Skills | Career Advancement | Personal Interest |
| Full-time | 61.7 | 27.6 | 5.7 | 5.0 |
| Part-time | 45.4 | 33.4 | 13.0 | 8.1 |

## Table 46

### Primary Reason for Attending College and Sex

| Sex | Primary Reason for Attending College | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Transfer | Occupation Skills | Career Advancement | Personal Interest |
| Male | 57.9 | 27.0 | 8.0 | 7.1 |
| Female | 48.1 | 34.7 | 10.5 | 6.7 |

Table 47

Primary Reason for Attending College
and Number of Credits Completed

| Number of Credits Completed | Primary Reason for Attending College | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Transfer | Occupation Skills | Career Advancement | Personal Interest |
| 0 - 14 | 47.4 | 34.1 | 11.3 | 7.3 |
| 15 - 29 | 50.2 | 37.3 | 7.0 | 5.5 |
| 30 - 44 | 59.1 | 28.7 | 8.6 | 3.3 |
| 45 - 59 | 62.4 | 24.8 | 6.6 | 6.2 |

## Sources of Information on Course Transferability

In a recent administrative petition filed in California by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) to ensure intersegmental articulation between the state's community college system and senior colleges comprising the University of California and California State University College systems, it cited lack of information on course transferability as one of the major obstacles to upward transfer. As part of this study, students were asked to indicate how they ascertain which courses are eligible for transfer to a four-year college.

The findings reported on this item (Table 48) refer only to those students who indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college. The majority of students (63%) indicated that the major source of information on course transferability is the catalog/or course schedule; of less importance is information provided by counselors (45%), or information obtained from the four-year college to which they plan on transferring (33%). Eleven percent of the students indicated that they did not know which of their courses were transfer eligible.

Relying on catalogs or course schedules as the main source of information about course transferability may result in problems later on because the information becomes outdated quickly. Additionally, catalogs only provide information on general transfer requirements, and not on specific major requirements.

Table 48

Sources of Information on Course Transferability
Among Students Whose Primary Reason for Attending College
is to Prepare for Transfer

| Source of Information | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Catalog/Course Schedule | 62.6 | 37.4 |
| Counselors | 45.2 | 54.8 |
| Four-year College/University | 33.1 | 66.9 |
| Friend | 9.3 | 90.7 |

## Source of Information on Transfer Opportunities

In addition to asking students about their sources of information on course transferability, they were asked to indicate how important a role counselors, teachers, and friends played in providing information on transfer opportunities (Table 19). Of the three possible choices, the proportion of students choosing counselors (44%) as a very important source of information was greater than teachers (38%) or friends (22%). Even so, only 44% of the students said that counselors were very important as a source of information on course transferability.

Two reports recently released by California (CPEC, 1984) and the City University of New York (CUNY, 1984) identified weaknesses in community college counseling services, specifically early identification and tracking of transfer students was cited as a recurring problem. Despite reported weaknesses in counseling services, our findings tend to indicate that students perceive counselors as the logical source of information on transfer opportunities.

Table 49

Relative Importance of Counselors, Teachers, and Friends as a Source of Information on Transfer Opportunities

| | Very Important | Not Important |
|---|---|---|
| Counselors (n: 781) | 44.3 | 20.9 |
| Teachers (n: 780) | 37.7 | 24.0 |
| Friends (n: 760) | 21.6 | 37.1 |

NOTES: The rows do not add-up to a 100% because the "somewhat important" category is not included in the table. These data are only for students who indicated preparing for transfer is their primary reason for attending college.

## Student Involvement in the Institutional Environment

The recently released report by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (NIE, 1984) identified student involvement as one of the most important conditions for improving undergraduate education. According to the study group, students who exhibit a high level of involvement in their studies, in campus-related activities, and engage in frequent interaction with faculty are likely to be more committed to learning and more persistent than uninvolved students.

Encouraging student involvement is particularly critical in community colleges due to their commuting nature and preponderance of part-time students and faculty. Several of the items included in the questionnaire were intended to measure the underlying aspects of student involvement such as participation in support service activities, contact with faculty in a variety of contexts, and commitment to learning.

Involvement in Support Service Activities. To determine the extent of student involvement in support services, students were asked to indicate whether they had participated in activities ranging from academic counseling to special activities related to preparing for transfer. In addition to asking students about their participation, in those items to which they responded negatively they were asked to indicate whether non-participation was due to not needing the service, not being aware of it, or lack of time to participate. The results are shown below in Table 50.

## Table 50

## Student Involvement in Support Service Activities

| Support Service Activity | Percentage Participating | Reason for Not Participating | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No need | No time | Not aware of service |
| Academic Counseling | 48.7 | 26.1 | 34.6 | 39.3 |
| Career Counseling | 33.0 | 32.2 | 30.2 | 37.6 |
| Freshman Orientation | 31.3 | 32.9 | 24.0 | 43.0 |
| Meeting with Senior College Recruiters | 21.0 | 19.4 | 25.3 | 55.4 |
| Orientation for Potential Transfer Students | 20.5 | 18.4 | 25.2 | 56.4 |
| Study Group | 19.3 | 29.6 | 29.1 | 41.3 |
| Study Skill Workshops | 16.9 | 34.1 | 27.2 | 38.7 |
| Honors Programs | 13.2 | 16.4 | 24.5 | 59.1 |
| Senior Colleges Applications Workshop | 10.0 | 28.4 | 15.7 | 55.9 |

NOTE: These data are only for students who indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college.

The activity in which the highest proportion of potential transfer students have participated is academic counseling (49%). In all of the other activities, with the exception of career counseling (33%), less than one-third of the students have participated. More than half of the sampled students reported not being aware of activities for potential transfer students, e.g., special meetings with recruiters from senior colleges (55%), and workshops on completing senior college applications (56%). Lack of awareness of these activities may indicate that the colleges do not offer these programs or if they are offered, it may be only in special occasions, rather than as part of a comprehensive transfer counseling program. Data from 18 of the 24 UCCTOP colleges revealed that ten colleges offer orientation sessions for potential transfer students, eighteen sponsor meetings with senior college recruiters, and only seven hold special workshops to instruct students how to complete senior college admission applications.

The low level of participation in all of the activities is rather revealing: the majority of students who regard themselves as potential transfer students do not appear to be engaged in the kinds of activities that might reinforce their aspirations for a baccalaureate or higher degree.

## Student-Faculty Interaction

Formal and informal interaction with faculty (Astin, 1977) have been found to be important predictors of student persistence. However, Astin also reports that student interaction with faculty in community colleges is lower than in other types of institutions. The faculty survey findings (reported in the preceding section), tend to confirm that faculty have little contact with students outside the classroom environment. Similarly, the proportion of students who indicated frequent contact with faculty in a variety of formal and informal contexts was very low. For instance, only 18 percent of potential transfer students indicated that they frequently make appointments with their instructors; only nine percent reported having had an informal conversation with faculty.

Table 51

Formal and Informal Interaction with Faculty

| Formal/Informal Contact | Frequently | Rarely |
|---|---|---|
| Asked instructor for additional references on a topic | 25.8 | 31.9 |
| Made appointment to talk with instructor | 17.5 | 37.7 |
| Asked faculty for advice | 13.1 | 51.5 |
| Made informal conversation with an instructor | 8.5 | 67.3 |

NOTE: These data are only for students who indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college.

## Commitment to Learning

An institutional environment with a strong emphasis on intellectual development will foster conditions that lead to student commitment to learning. For students who begin their higher education in a community college with the intent of transferring to a senior institution, the college's orientation towards learning as reflected in the values, goals, and norms shared by the college community can be a major factor in reinforcing their initial aspirations for a baccalaureate degree. Demonstrating a strong institutional commitment to learning is also of great importance in community colleges because the majority of students they attract are less likely to have developed a commitment to learning and educational goals, compared to students who began their education in senior colleges. Unless there is a joint effort between the institution and the individual to develop a commitment to learning, the likelihood of transferring, and of succeeding after transferring, are diminished.

The institution has the primary responsibility of creating conditions that will stimulate student involvement and a commitment to learning. This can be achieved by setting high and rigorous standards, by rewarding achievement, and providing opportunities, other than within the context of the classroom, that can enrich and broaden the individual's knowledge base. The student should be made to feel responsible for his/her learning: it is up to the individual's own efforts to take advantage of every possible opportunity the institution makes available for involvement in the formal and academic environment.

Items related to institutional efforts to foster a commitment to learning consisted of questions related to course assignments students had to complete during the 1983-84 academic year in order to determine the amount of reading and writing that is required of students. The findings revealed that students whose primary reason for attending college is to prepare for transfer had limited reading and writing assignments.

The data in Table 52 reveal that the average number of assigned textbooks and written assignments for the majority of students is less than five. Much of the writing students appear to engage in is task-oriented (Table 53); for instance, 76 and 59 percent of the students indicated taking detailed notes in class and from reading assignments respectively.

Our findings tend to be similar to observations made by

Richardson, Fisk, and Okun (1983) that much of the reading and writing students are required to do is restricted to "bitting" rather than "texting."

> Texting involves the use of reading and writing to comprehend or compose connected language without the assistance of specific cues... . Bitting [is] the use of reading or writing to understand or produce fragmented language when presented with specific cues (p. 65).

Bitting, according to these observers, has become the norm for written requirements because the majority of instructors they interviewed considered the ability to take lecture notes considerably more important than, for instance, developing an outline to write an original essay.

Another interesting observation made by these writers is regarding the use of and value placed on books. They report that interviews with Oakwood's (fictitious name of community college on which their case study is based) bookstore personnel revealed that of 4,000 books ordered for an introductory course, only 180 had been sold. Moreover, students sold their books after completing a course. Perhaps the unintended effect of over-reliance in the transmission of knowledge through structured lectures renders textbooks useless and valueless in the eyes of students.

## Table 52

### Reading and Writing Requirements

| Assignments | None | Less than 5 | 5-10 | 10 or more |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Required Textbooks | 3.0 | 45.5 | 39.1 | 12.4 |
| Assigned Termpapers/ Reports | 12.6 | 47.6 | 25.0 | 14.8 |
| Essay Exams | 11.4 | 38.0 | 33.7 | 16.8 |

NOTE: These data are only for students who indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college.

## Table 53

### Student-Initiated Efforts within the Academic Environment

| Student Efforts | Frequently | Rarely |
|---|---|---|
| Taken detailed notes in class | 75.5 | 4.2 |
| Taken notes from reading assignments | 59.3 | 7.5 |
| Sought assistance from instructor to improve writing skills | 14.9 | 49.8 |

NOTES: The rows do not add up to 100 percent because the response category "occasionally" is not included in the table. These data are only for students who indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college.

In addition to asking students about course requirements, they were asked to respond to items related to self-initiated efforts related to a commitment to learning.

Regarding study habits, 41 percent of the respondents who are preparing for transfer reported that on the average they spend three or more daily hours studying and 60 percent reported studying between one and two hours per day. And 48 percent of the respondents indicated using the library frequently to study; only 13 percent of the students reported rarely using the library to study.

Up to this point we have provided general descriptive information on the sampled students with regard to demographic characteristics, educational aspirations and career goals, and some measures of social and academic involvement among students who identify themselves as potential transfer students. While the data provide a comprehensive overview of the sampled students in general, they are limited inasmuch as few generalizations can be made regarding what might be the important factors underlying predisposition to transfer as well as what might be the critical variables affecting predisposition to transfer. In the section that follows a more detailed analysis of student transfer attitudes and behaviors is provided.

## Student Predisposition to Transfer

From the results reported in the previous sections, we determined that 74 percent of the sampled students aspire to a B.A. or higher degree and that 53 percent indicated that their primary reason for attending the college was to prepare for transfer; however, these data have certain limitations for they only describe student aspirations. Student aspirations could vary in meaningfulness according to other student characteristics. It is possible that some students might have indicated a high level of aspirations in degree plans without having considered the time, effort, and commitment required to attain their goals. In considering the question, "What is the highest degree you plan on obtaining?" The students might have chosen the highest and most prestigious degree despite ambiguity about their goals and uncertainty about their motivations. For the students who are uncertain or perhaps even doubtful of what they are capable of achieving, expressing a high level of aspiration does not represent as high a risk for disappointment as for the students who are truly committed and highly motivated.

Evidence that there is a disparity between stated degree aspirations and subsequent actions is provided by data from other studies showing that only one-fourth of students who aspire to a B.A. or higher degree actually transfer (Astin, 1983). Similarly, the fact that 74% of the sampled students indicated aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree, yet only 53 percent indicated that their primary reason for attending the college was to prepare for transfer insinuates a discontinuity between degree aspirations and certainty about the purpose of attending college.

In analyzing the data, we began to suspect a weak link between aspiration levels and the attitudes and behaviors exhibited by students. With the exception of Karabel (1977), few studies of community colleges allude to the possibility that student degree aspirations may not be a relevant measure of expectations or motivation. Alexander and Cook (1979) have made some interesting propositions on different interpretations that can be ascribed to educational plans. Their observations about the relationship between educational plans as predictors of actual college attendance are of particular relevance to the relationship between degree aspirations and transfer likelihood among community college students. According to their interpretation:

> Longstanding goals for college are quite likely to be translated into actual attendance. On the other hand, more recently formulated plans fare considerably poorer in forecasting college attendance, perhaps surprisingly so since they are developed nearer to the transition. Thus, students whose judgements are swayed by short-term situational cues appear to be both less strongly wedded to their educational goals and less adept in interpreting the circumstances that bear upon them (p. 210).

To assess the strength of student commitment to the goals of upward transfer, using factor analysis (see appendix for the procedural steps followed), a measure of transfer-related attitudes and a measure of transfer-related behaviors were developed that would make possible the classification of students on the basis of high/low transfer attitudes and high/low transfer behaviors. Furthermore, these measures would also allow us to compare the concentration of students in four possible groupings: (1) low transfer attitudes/low transfer behaviors; (2) high transfer attitudes/low transfer behaviors; (3) high transfer behaviors/low transfer attitudes; and (4) high transfer attitudes/high transfer behaviors. This organizational scheme would allow measuring predisposition to transfer by taking into account student transfer attitudes and behaviors; clearly the students who fell into the category of high transfer attitudes and high transfer behaviors would be the likeliest candidates for transfer.

Creating these two measures provided another important advantage in that it would be possible to determine whether differences exist between students who fall into the four possible group categories. That is, high transfer attitudes as opposed to high transfer behaviors might be a function of individual differences stemming from educational background or from differences in the way students experience the institutional environment, i.e., active participation in certain types of activities might be a predictor of behaviors but not of attitudes.

## Measures of Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors

To construct the transfer attitudinal and behavioral measures, questionnaire items were selected for possible inclusion based on their face validity. Items were selected for consideration if they could logically be taken to indicate transfer predisposition based on one or more of the following three criteria:

(1) the item reflected student awareness of transfer opportunities;

(2) the item reflected student planning in anticipation of transferring;

(3) the item reflected the relative importance of transferring to the student.

The total number of items meeting these criteria were entered into a factor analysis equation. Attitudinal items clustered in the first factor and behavioral items clustered in the third one; the second factor consisted of items that reflected student satisfaction regarding the college's effectiveness in preparing them for upward transfer. While this factor was unrelated to predisposition to transfer, it was used to compare differences in student attitudes towards the institution according to selected student characteristics. These findings are presented in the last section.

Since not all factor items are of equal importance, only items with loadings greater than (+) or (-) 0.30 were retained. Five items were retained in the transfer attitudinal measure; four items were retained in the transfer behavioral measure; and three items were retained in the measure of student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function.

Transfer Attitudinal Measure.* The five attitudinal items were Likert type items which asked the student to choose a response ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The five items were:

(1) Transferring to a four-year college is not that important to me. (Desired response is strong disagreement or disagreement.)

(2) Transferring to a four-year college is too far off in the future to worry about it now. (Desired response is strong disagreement or disagreement.)

(3) If I don't transfer to a four-year college, I will feel disappointed. (Desired response strong agreement or agreement.)

---

* All attitudinal items were specifically constructed for the purposes of this study.

(4) Transfer courses are not very useful because you don't learn any practical skills (desired response is strong disagreement or disagreement).

(5) For me, getting a job is more important than transferring to a four-year college (desired response is strong disagreement or disagreement).

Depending on the individual responses to the five items, students were scored a five or a four when they provided one of the two desired responses, a three for neutral, and a two or one for the undesired response (e.g., for item one, strong disagreement = 5; disagreement = 4; neutral = 3; agreement = 2; and strong agreement = 1).

To determine the cut-off points delineating high versus low transfer attitudes it was decided that a student to be classified as having high transfer attitudes should score at least a twenty; anyone with a score of less than 20 was placed into the low attitude group. If a student scored a five in each of the five items, he would have earned a score of 25, the highest possible score; students scoring a four in each of the items would have scored a 20. However, a 20 could also be scored by someone who had a combination of scores (e.g., three 5's, one 3, and one 2).

The distribution of scores showed that a score of 15 fell into the 25th percentile and a score of 21 into the 75th percentile. Therefore, a score of 20 was just slightly below the 75th percentile. Of the 1,532 students who were included in the analysis, 672 or 44 percent fell into the high transfer attitude category. The 1,532 students represent all students who have not earned a baccalaureate degree, while not all of these students indicated they aspire to a B.A. or higher degree or indicated preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college, they were nonetheless included in the analysis because it was considered important to calculate a measure indicating the actual proportion of a community college's population that have high and low transfer attitudes. Among students who indicated aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree the proportion exhibiting high transfer attitudes was 54%, ten percentage points higher than for the whole sample.

Transfer Behavioral Measure.* The four items comprising the behavioral measure reflected student actions in preparation for transfer. They were:

(1) Transfer Knowledge: a composite of three items that asked the student to indicate the sources used to determine transferability of courses taken in the community college. The three possible sources of information were: (1) catalog/course schedule; (2) counselors; (3) by having checked with the four-year college to which they plan on transferring. Since the student could check as many of the choices that were applicable, the highest possible score for this item was 3.

(2) Course Transferability: Students were asked to list the courses in which they were enrolled during the semester or quarter in which the survey was taken (Spring 1984) and to indicate for each whether they knew if the course was transferable as an elective or toward his/her chosen major or was not eligible for transfer. This item was scored on the basis

---

* All behavioral items were specifically constructed for the purposes of this study.

of the number of courses listed. For instance, if a student was taking four courses and he knew the transfer eligibility for all four, his score would be a four. In order not to penalize students who were taking fewer courses, the scores were standardized. The only undesired response under this category was not knowing if the course was or was not transferable.

(3) Transfer Planning: A composite of four items asked students planning to transfer to indicate whether they had (1) requested catalog(s) and application form(s) from those colleges and universities to which they were hoping to transfer; (2) asked their counselor(s) for information about the college's requirements for transfer applicants; (3) visited the colleges; and (4) completed and submitted transfer applications. The highest possible score on this item was 4.

(4) Transfer Information: An item which asked students whether they had sought information on transfer opportunities from the counseling office frequently, occasionally, or rarely. The highest possible score in this item was three.

The highest possible score on this measure was 15 points; however, the cut-off point selected to differentiate high versus low transfer behaviors was 11. That is, students scoring 11 or higher were classified as measuring high on transfer behaviors. This cut-off point was determined as follows: for item one, a student should have scored at least 2 out of 3 possible points; for item two, a student should have a perfect score (four points); for item three, the score should be at least a 2 out of a possible 4; and for the last item, the student should score a 3.

The range of scores showed that a score of 9 fell into the 75th percentile; therefore, the cut-off score for high behaviors (11) that was selected was fairly high. However, given the items comprising the scale it was decided that a score of 11 even though somewhat high was nonetheless an accurate measure of high behaviors.

Of 1,542 students who responded to the items in the measure, 192 or 12 percent of the sample were classified as having high transfer behaviors. While the scoring mechanism used is somewhat biased towards the high scores, it is noted that transfer rates in community colleges range from 3 to 10 percent of total enrollment. Therefore, that 12 percent of the sampled students showed to have high transfer behaviors appears to indicate that the measure being used is discriminating fairly well between those students that are very likely to transfer and those that are more marginal. Among students who aspire to a B.A. or higher degree, 16 percent exhibited high transfer behaviors, which is four percentage points higher than for the whole sample.

## Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors of Potential Transfer Students

In the remainder of this section the data presented are only for those students who indicated aspiring to a baccalaureate or higher degree.

Table 54 shows the distribution of B.A. or higher degree aspirants among four possible categories: (1) low transfer attitudes and transfer behaviors; (2) high transfer attitudes and transfer behaviors; (3) high transfer attitudes and low transfer behaviors; and (4) low transfer attitudes and high transfer behaviors.

Table 54

Transfer attitudes and behaviors among B.A. and higher degree aspirants

| Attitudes | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| High | 13.7 | 42.7 |
| Low | 3.1 | 40.6 |

NOTE: The total sample shown in this distribution is 973 students.

Less than half of the sampled students (41%) score low on both transfer attitudes and behaviors; more than one-third have high transfer attitudes but low transfer behaviors (43%); and fourteen percent are high on both transfer attitudes and behaviors. The three percent that are low on attitudes but high on behaviors are an unusual group in that it is highly unlikely that students would have high transfer behaviors but low transfer attitudes. However, since it is a very small group (only 30 students), it is not of major consequence.

Undoubtedly, the students who fell into the high transfer attitudes and behaviors cell of the two-by-two table are the ones who show the highest predisposition to transfer: for these students the importance of transfer is clear in their attitudes as well as in their motivation to follow-through with their plans by getting information on transfer opportunities from a variety of sources, ascertaining course transferability, and consulting with counselors about transfer opportunities. In contrast, the group that falls into the high transfer attitudes but low transfer behaviors cell of the table are students who have yet to translate the importance they ascribe to transferring into more purposeful actions. Even though the likelihood of transfer among these students is less certain than for the high attitude/high behavior group, many are likely to, particularly if they are exposed to transfer planning activities. The students in greatest need of help, needless to say, are those who fall into the low attitude/low behavior category.

## Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Selected Student Characteristics

After having organized the student sample on the basis of transfer attitudes and behaviors, the next logical step was to examine what differentiates students with high versus low transfer attitudes, with high versus low transfer behaviors, and between high transfer attitudes versus high transfer behaviors.

Demographic Characteristics. No major differences were found in the distribution of males and females in the attitudinal and behavioral measures of transfer, except that females do seem to score a little higher than males in the behavioral measure. Table 55 shows the distribution for male and females in the two measures.

Number of credits earned, attendance status, and age appear to be related to changes in transfer attitudes and behaviors. Students who have earned more than 30 but less than 60 credits are more likely to have high transfer attitudes and behaviors as are students who are young, and students who attend college full-time.

Table 55

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by sex

| | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| Males | 54.5 | 45.5 | 14.3 | 85.7 |
| Females | 57.4 | 42.6 | 18.7 | 81.3 |

Table 56

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by number of units completed

| Units Completed | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| 0 - 14 units | 51.6 | 48.4 | 4.2 | 95.8 |
| 15 - 29 units | 47.9 | 52.1 | 10.9 | 89.1 |
| 30 - 44 units | 57.8 | 42.2 | 15.2 | 84.8 |
| 45 - 59 units | 68.5 | 31.5 | 29.8 | 70.2 |
| 60 or more units | 58.1 | 41.9 | 25.8 | 74.2 |

As shown in Table 56, the highest concentration of students with high transfer attitudes and behaviors is among those having completed 45 to 59 units, or the equivalent of sophomore status.

High transfer behaviors are almost three times as likely (30%) among students who have reached the equivalent of advanced sophomore status (45-59 units), than among students having completed 15-29 units (11%). While high transfer behaviors are expected to occur more frequently among advanced students, it should be recognized that if these behaviors are developed in students in the early stages of their education their chances of persisting should increase. Not surprisingly, full-time students are also more likely to show high transfer attitudes and behaviors than students who attend college on a part-time basis.

Table 57

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by attendance status

| Attendance Status | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| Full-time | 62.3 | 37.7 | 26.6 | 73.4 |
| Part-time | 50.2 | 49.8 | 5.4 | 94.6 |

Age also affects transfer attitudes and behaviors: students who are 18-22 years old, as well as those 23-25 years old are more likely to show high transfer attitudes and behaviors than older students.

Table 58

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by age

| Age | Attitudes |  | Behaviors |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | High | Low | High | Low |
| 18-22 years old | 61.5 | 38.5 | 18.4 | 81.6 |
| 23-25 years old | 60.1 | 39.9 | 18.1 | 81.9 |
| 26-30 years old | 50.9 | 49.1 | 17.6 | 82.4 |
| 31-40 years old | 48.8 | 51.2 | 11.6 | 88.4 |
| Older than 40 | 38.5 | 61.5 | 7.7 | 92.3 |

The findings reported so far show that students who most closely resemble the traditional college student in terms of age and attendance status are the likeliest candidates for transfer. While these findings are neither surprising nor novel, they are highlighted because few community colleges take into consideration these differences in the delivery of services to potential transfer students.

Transfer attitude and behavior differences were also found on the basis of employment status: students who work 30 or less hours per week are more likely to have high transfer attitudes and behaviors than either unemployed students or students employed 31 or more hours per week (Table 59).

Table 59

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by employment status

| Employment Status | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| Unemployed | 55.2 | 44.8 | 15.1 | 84.9 |
| 1-20 weekly hours | 58.4 | 41.6 | 18.9 | 81.1 |
| 21-30 weekly hours | 61.6 | 38.4 | 23.3 | 76.7 |
| 31-40 weekly hours | 50.5 | 49.5 | 14.5 | 85.5 |
| Over 40 weekly hours | 53.9 | 46.1 | 10.1 | 89.9 |

Income levels appear not to have as strong a relationship to transfer attitudes and behaviors as some of the other student variables discussed so far. The concentration of students with high transfer attitudes and behaviors increase only slightly as income levels go up as shown in Table 60.

## Table 60

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by income levels

| Annual Income | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| Less Than $5,999 | 48.7 | 51.3 | 15.4 | 84.6 |
| $6,000 - 10,999 | 51.5 | 48.5 | 16.6 | 83.4 |
| $11,000 - 20,999 | 57.9 | 42.1 | 15.9 | 84.1 |
| $21,000 - 29,999 | 61.1 | 38.9 | 20.1 | 79.9 |
| $30,000 and higher | 63.3 | 36.7 | 16.7 | 83.3 |

## Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Degree Aspirations

Degree aspirations have been shown to affect persistence in college (Astin, 1983), thus transfer attitudes and behaviors were examined to determine whether any differences might exist among students aspiring to a B.A., graduate, or professional degree. The data presented in Table 61 show that students who aspire to a graduate degree are more likely to show high transfer attitudes and behaviors than students who aspire to a B.A. or professional degree, or who are undecided about degree aspirations.

Table 61

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by degree aspirations

| Degree Aspirations | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| B.A. degree | 48.4 | 51.6 | 12.8 | 87.2 |
| Graduate degree | 69.2 | 30.8 | 22.7 | 77.3 |
| Professional degree | 57.4 | 42.6 | 19.1 | 80.9 |
| Undecided | 25.9 | 74.1 | 4.7 | 95.3 |

## Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors and Reason for Attending College

Students who indicated both that they aspired to a B.A. or higher degree and that their primary reason for attending college was to prepare for transfer were more likely to show high transfer attitudes and behaviors than students, who despite aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree, gave as their primary reason for attending college "gain occupational skills" or "occupational advancement" or "satisfy personal interest."

Table 62

Transfer attitudes and behaviors
and primary reason for attending college

| Primary Reason for Attending College | Attitudes | | Behaviors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High | Low | High | Low |
| Prepare for transfer | 67.4 | 32.6 | 19.7 | 80.3 |
| Gain occupational skills | 35.4 | 64.6 | 11.0 | 89.0 |
| Occupational advancement | 28.6 | 71.4 | 10.2 | 89.8 |
| Satisfy personal interest | 39.0 | 61.0 | 14.6 | 85.4 |

High transfer behaviors are shown by 20 percent of students who chose preparing for transfer as their primary reason for attending college as opposed to 11 percent among students who indicated that their primary reason was to gain occupational skills. Among students who indicated occupational advancement or satisfy a personal interest as their primary reasons for attending college, the proportion with high behaviors was 10 and 15 percent respectively. High transfer attitudes were shown also by a considerably higher proportion of students (67%) who said that preparing for transfer was their primary reason for attending college, compared to students who chose to gain occupational skills (35%), students who chose occupational advancement (29%), and students who chose to satisfy a personal interest (39%) as their primary reasons for attending college.

Despite giving different responses to primary reason for attending college, all the students included in Table 62 indicated nonetheless that they aspired to a B.A. or higher degree. What these findings point out is that degree aspirations for community college students may not always be a good discriminator of transfer potential since students may say they plan on earning a B.A. or higher degree but give reasons other than transfer for having enrolled in college. Consequently, community colleges concerned with the identification of potential transfer students at the point of entry should give attention to the kinds of information gathered through admission forms.

## The Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors of Minority Students

The impetus behind UCCTOP was to improve transfer opportunities in colleges with high minority enrollments. Consequently, in this section data are provided for the purpose of examining differences in transfer attitudes and behaviors across ethnic groups in relation to selected characteristics.

Table 63 provides the distribution of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White students on the attitudinal and behavioral transfer measures. All of the data provided for minority students includes only those students who indicated they plan on earning a B.A. or higher degree.

Table 63

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by race.

| Groups | Attitudes |  | Behaviors |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | High | Low | High | Low |
| Asian (n: 136) | 61.0 | 39.0 | 24.3 | 75.7 |
| Black (n: 296) | 49.7 | 50.3 | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| Hispanic (n: 164) | 57.9 | 42.1 | 15.2 | 84.8 |
| White (n: 281) | 60.1 | 39.9 | 19.9 | 80.1 |

The proportion of students across the four ethnic categories exhibiting high transfer attitudes is fairly stable, there is a difference of 10 percentage points between Asians, who have the highest concentration in high transfer attitudes (60%) and blacks, who have the lowest concentration (50%). In contrast, major differences are shown among the ethnic groups with regard to high transfer behaviors. Twenty-four percent of Asian students show high transfer behaviors compared to 20 percent among whites, 15 percent among Hispanics, and 12 percent among blacks. Of the four groups, Black and Hispanic students are likely to require the greatest attention to assist them in developing attitudes and behaviors that are more consistent with their degree aspirations.

As noted earlier, transfer attitudes and behaviors appear to be strongly related to other student characteristics, e.g., number of units completed and degree aspirations. Therefore, it might be possible that differences in transfer attitudes and behaviors across the four minority groups may be reduced when controlling for the effect of these variables. Table 64 shows the distribution of transfer attitudes and behaviors for the four ethnic groups controlling for number of units completed.

Table 64

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by race and units completed of B.A. or higher degree aspirants

| | 0-29 Units | | | | 30-59 Units | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Asians | Blacks | Hispanic | Whites | Asians | Blacks | Hispanic | Whites |
| High Attitudes | 67.3 | 42.4 | 30.2 | 46.6 | 64.2 | 58.6 | 60.0 | 67.6 |
| High Behaviors | 15.4 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 28.3 | 13.5 | 22.0 | 26.1 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The distribution pattern for high transfer behaviors across the four groups who have completed 0-29 credits shows the same tendency as with transfer attitudes: Asians (15%) have a considerably higher proportion of students with high transfer behaviors when compared to whites (7%), blacks (6%), and Hispanics (5%). The proportion of Asian and White students who have completed 30-59 units and show high transfer behaviors is fairly close, 28 and 26 percent respectively. Again, the magnitude in the change based on units completed is considerably greater among whites than among Asians. The concentration of Hispanic students with high transfer behaviors also goes up dramatically from 5% in the 0-29 units completed to 22% in the 30-59 units completed. Blacks, who have completed 30-59 units, on the other hand, who had about the same concentration of high transfer behavior students in the 0-29 units completed as whites do not increase at the same rate. They increase only by 8 percentage points, which is less than half of the increase experienced by Hispanics or Whites.

From these findings it appears that Asians develop high transfer attitudes and behaviors earlier than the other groups. Of interest is that whites and Hispanics become more similar in transfer behaviors as Asians when the number of units they complete rises. For these students, the longer they persist the more real transfer likelihood becomes. Among blacks, transfer behaviors seem to be less affected by the number of units completed.

Transfer attitudes and behaviors appear to be particularly sensitive to degree aspirations: students who aspire to a graduate degree are more likely to exhibit higher transfer attitudes and behaviors than students who aspire to a B.A. or professional degree.

Table 65 shows that among blacks who aspire to a graduate degree twice as many (16%) than B.A. aspirants (8%) show high transfer behaviors. Among Hispanics who aspire to a graduate degree 29% show high transfer behaviors as opposed to 10% among those who aspire to a B.A. degree. Among Asians and whites the changes are more evident in transfer attitudes than in transfer behaviors. For instance, 75% of Asians who aspire to a graduate degree have high transfer attitudes in contrast to 53% among B.A. aspirants. Hispanics who aspire to a graduate degree have the biggest concentration of any other group in the high transfer behaviors category.

Table 65

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by degree plans and ethnicity.

| Degree Plans | Asian | | Black | | Hispanic | | White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HA | HB | HA | HB | HA | HB | HA | HB |
| Bachelor | 53.0 | 22.9 | 42.2 | 7.8 | 55.3 | 9.6 | 51.0 | 16.8 |
| Graduate | 75.0 | 27.1 | 64.4 | 15.8 | 68.8 | 29.2 | 71.6 | 24.2 |
| Professor | 60.0 | 20.0 | 41.4 | 17.2 | 45.5 | 9.1 | 71.0 | 22.6 |

Note: HA = High Transfer Attitudes; HB = High Transfer Behaviors.

## Predisposition to Transfer and Measures of Student Involvement

Major differences are evidenced in transfer attitudes and behaviors in relation to study habits, formal and informal contact with faculty, participation in support service activities and transfer-related activities, and the sources of information on transfer regarded as important by students. These differences are not only between the high versus low categories for attitudes and behaviors respectively, but also between high attitudes versus high behaviors. That is, students with high transfer behaviors as opposed to high transfer attitudes are more likely to report spending more time studying, having greater contact with faculty, and more frequent participation in counseling and related activities. These data tend to support the notion that students with high transfer behaviors have attained a higher level of institutional integration than students who have high transfer attitudes.

Quality of Effort. Community colleges have a responsibility to foster environments that will stimulate student commitment to learning and long-term educational goals. While it is an institutional responsibility to establish mechanisms that will induce norms and values supportive of students' transfer goals, it is also important to recognize, as Pace (1984) states, that:

> the students are also accountable for the amount, scope, and quality of effort they invest in their own learning and development, and specifically in using the facilities and opportunities that are available in the college setting. Accountability for achievement and related student outcomes must consider both what the institution offers and what the students do with those offerings (pp. 6-7).

The quality and extent of individual efforts associated with a commitment to learning were measured by including items into the questionnaire related to study habits, use of and participation in support service activities, and student intitiative to interact with their instructors. Earlier in this section our findings for these variables were reported with regard to all sampled students who had indicated preparing to transfer as their primary reason for attending college. The analysis reported here attempts to illustrate that differences exist in quality of effort between students that demonstrate high transfer attitudes in contrast to students with high transfer behaviors. It will be clear from the data presented below, that students with high transfer behaviors stand apart from students with high transfer attitudes in just about all of the measures related to quality of effort.

Study Habits. Students who spend at least three hours per day studying tend to have higher transfer attitudes and behaviors than students who study two hours or one hour per day (Table 66).

Table 66

Transfer attitudes and behaviors by daily study hours

| Daily Study Hours | Attitudes |  | Behaviors |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | High | Low | High | Low |
| Three hours per day | 61.4 | 38.6 | 25.4 | 74.6 |
| Two hours per day | 55.9 | 44.1 | 14.0 | 86.0 |
| One hour per day | 48.3 | 51.7 | 4.9 | 95.1 |

Students who report frequently using the library to study and frequently taking detailed notes in class, tend to have higher transfer attitudes than students who said they rarely engaged in these activities. However, students who indicated rarely taking notes from reading assignments were more likely to have high transfer attitudes (64%) than students whose response was frequently (59%).

The differences are particularly marked in the transfer behaviors measure. For instance, students who report frequent use of the library to study, frequently taking detailed notes in class, and frequently taking notes from reading assignments are more than twice as likely to show high transfer behaviors than students who reported rarely doing these things.

Table 67

Study habits in relation to transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| | Use library to study | | Taking detailed notes in class | | Taking notes from reading assignments | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely |
| Attitudes | | | | | | |
| High | 62.9 | 49.6 | 60.1 | 51.6 | 59.4 | 63.6 |
| Low | 37.1 | 50.4 | 39.9 | 48.4 | 40.6 | 36.4 |
| Behaviors | | | | | | |
| High | 21.5 | 11.1 | 19.1 | 6.5 | 19.9 | 7.6 |
| Low | 78.5 | 88.9 | 80.9 | 93.5 | 80.1 | 92.4 |

Note: The response choice "occassionally" is not included in this table.

Use of Support Services. Transfer attitudes do not seem to vary greatly between students who have and students who have not made use of the five types of support services shown in Table 68.

Greater differences are shown with regard to transfer behaviors between students who have and students who have not made use of support services. In general, students who participate in support service activities tend to show a greater concentration in high behaviors.

Admittedly, students can only make use of support services to the extent that they are made available by the colleges. Of the 18 colleges that responded to a short survey distributed among the 24 UCCTOP colleges, all offered academic and career counseling, and freshman orientation sessions. Fourteen colleges reported offering study skills workshops; and ten colleges reported having honors programs. Of these activities, honors programs appear to have the strongest relationship to student predisposition to transfer. Honors programs, inasmuch as they serve a select group of students, are likely to be small and highly cohesive; and they are likely to expose students to an academic and social environment not experienced by the majority of students.

Table 68

Use of support services in relation to transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors | Academic Counseling | | Career Counseling | | Study Skills Workshop | | Freshman Orientation | | Honors Program | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Attitudes | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | 57.9 | 54.7 | 60.5 | 54.0 | 55.7 | 56.5 | 55.3 | 56.9 | 61.1 | 55.5 |
| Low | 42.1 | 45.3 | 39.5 | 46.0 | 44.3 | 43.5 | 44.7 | 43.1 | 38.9 | 44.5 |
| Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | 21.9 | 11.3 | 22.3 | 13.6 | 21.9 | 15.4 | 19.8 | 15.1 | 29.9 | 14.5 |
| Low | 78.1 | 88.7 | 77.7 | 86.4 | 78.1 | 84.6 | 80.2 | 84.9 | 70.1 | 85.5 |

Participation in transfer-related services. Students who report having participated in transfer orientation sessions (at the community college), who have attended workshops on how to complete admission applications for senior colleges, and who have attended on-campus meetings with senior college recruiters are much more likely to have high transfer attitudes than students who reported not having participated. For instance, 74% of students who reported having attended on-campus meetings with senior college recruiters showed to have high transfer attitudes as opposed to 52% among non-participants.

Also, as shown in Table 69, major differences were found with regard to transfer behaviors among participants and non-participants in transfer-related services. Among students who reported attending transfer orientation sessions, 34% compared to 13% among non-participants showed to have high transfer behaviors. Similarly, 46 and 37 percent respectively of students who have participated in workshops to complete senior college applications and who have attended meetings of senior college recruiters showed to have high transfer behaviors in contrast to 14 and 12 percent respectively among non-participants.

Table 69

Participation in transfer-related activities in relation to transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| Attitudes and Behaviors | Transfer Orientation Sessions |  | Senior College Applications Workshops |  | On-Campus Meetings with Senior College Recruiters |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Attitudes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 66.1 | 54.2 | 64.8 | 55.4 | 74.1 | 51.7 |
| Low | 33.9 | 45.8 | 35.2 | 44.6 | 25.9 | 48.3 |
| Behaviors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High | 33.9 | 13.0 | 46.2 | 13.7 | 36.8 | 11.5 |
| Low | 66.1 | 87.0 | 53.8 | 86.3 | 63.2 | 88.5 |

Clearly, participation in transfer-specific activities should influence the transfer attitudes and behaviors of students. One would also assume that these are the kinds of activities that would be offered on an on-going basis in all UCCTOP colleges. Contrary to our expectations this was not the case; of the 18 colleges that responded to our short survey, eleven indicated that they did not hold workshops on how to complete admission applications for transfer to senior colleges; eight colleges reported not offering orientation sessions for potential transfer students. All 18 colleges, however, reported scheduling on-campus meetings with senior college recruiters.

Information sources on transfer opportunities. Students who consider counselors, teachers, and friends as very important sources of information on transfer opportunities have a greater tendency to show high transfer attitudes and behaviors than students who indicated these as not being important sources of transfer information.

Table 70 shows that among students who indicated that counselors were a very important source of information on transfer opportunities 62% had high transfer attitudes in contrast to 57% among students who said counselors were not an important source of information on transfer opportunities. Also, the proportion of students showing high transfer attitudes is higher among students who said teachers and friends were very important sources of information on transfer opportunities when compared to students who said they were not important.

Transfer behavior differences are considerable between students who said that counselors and teachers were a very important source of information on transfer opportunities and students who said they were not important. Twenty-four percent who said counselors were very important as a source of information compared to eight percent among those who said they were not had high transfer behaviors. Also, 24% of students who said teachers were very important as a source of information compared to 12% of those who said they were not had high transfer behaviors.

Table 70

Sources of information on transfer opportunities in relation to transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| | Counselors | | Teachers | | Friends | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VI | NI | VI | NI | VI | NI |
| Attitudes | | | | | | |
| High | 61.6 | 55.6 | 63.0 | 60.5 | 64.4 | 59.2 |
| Low | 38.4 | 44.4 | 37.0 | 39.5 | 35.6 | 40.8 |
| Behaviors | | | | | | |
| High | 24.4 | 7.7 | 24.2 | 11.8 | 16.9 | 14.4 |
| Low | 75.6 | 92.3 | 75.8 | 88.2 | 83.1 | 85.6 |

VI: Very Important
VI: Not Important

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student-Faculty Interaction. Table 71 shows differences in transfer attitudes and behaviors in relation to frequent or rare interaction with faculty. Although students who reported that they frequently interact with faculty overall tend to show higher transfer attitudes than students who report that they rarely interact with faculty, the differences between the two groups are not large. However, important differences are shown in the proportion of students with high transfer behaviors among those who report frequent interaction with faculty compared to students that rarely interact with faculty.

Table 71

Student-faculty interaction in relation to transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| | Asked instructor for references on specific topic | | Asked instructor for assistance with writing skills | | Made appointment with instructor | | Asked instructor for advice on future plans | | Had informal conversation with an instructor | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely | Frequently | Rarely |
| Attitudes | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | 58.6 | 54.0 | 61.5 | 56.4 | 63.4 | 54.7 | 59.1 | 54.2 | 58.8 | 43.3 |
| Low | 41.4 | 46.0 | 38.5 | 43.6 | 36.6 | 45.3 | 40.9 | 45.8 | 41.3 | 56.7 |
| Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | |
| High | 26.7 | 9.8 | 28.7 | 12.7 | 29.2 | 8.1 | 30.3 | 9.3 | 33.8 | 13.8 |
| Low | 73.3 | 90.2 | 71.3 | 87.3 | 70.8 | 91.9 | 69.7 | 90.7 | 66.3 | 86.2 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One possible interpretation of these findings is that students with high transfer behaviors are far more likely to assume responsibility in establishing relationships with their instructors that go beyond the boundaries of the classroom. More frequent interaction with faculty in a greater variety of contexts may be an indication that students with high transfer behaviors have a greater awareness of their role as students and the multifaceted nature of the collegiate experience. Conversely, rare interaction with faculty may reflect disengagement and thus lessen the probabilities of involvement in areas that might influence transfer-related behaviors.

## Predictor Variables of Transfer Predisposition

The relationship of independent variables (e.g., student demographic characteristics, involvement and participation in support services) to transfer attitudes and behaviors so far has been examined for each independent variable alone. While this approach has provided valuable insights about differences in student characteristics that influence high versus low transfer attitudes and behaviors, it has some serious limitations. For example, from the findings reported so far, it is not possible to determine which of the independent variables are the most important predictors of transfer attitudes and which are the most important predictors of transfer behaviors. Similarly, we are unable to determine whether the same or different independent variables have an effect on attitudes and behaviors. Lastly, when each independent variable is examined in isolation of all others, it is impossible to determine whether a variable that might appear to be significantly related to transfer attitudes and behaviors will retain its significance when other variables are taken into account simultaneously.

Consequently, to overcome these limitations the final step in the data analyses was that of submitting all of the independent variables to regression analysis. Using backward regression two separate prediction equations, one for transfer attitudes and the other for transfer behaviors, were generated. The rationale behind such an approach can be conceptualized in the following manner: given all the independent variables, which of the items are the least useful in explaining the variance in the dependent measures -- transfer attitudes and behaviors. Thus, all items* related to (1) demographic characteristics, (2) integration into the academic environment, (3) integration into the social environment, and (4) individual attributes were initially entered into the regression equation, and only those items which explained a significant amount of the variance of transfer attitudes and behaviors were kept. The next step was to eliminate the variable which explained the least amount of variance, relative to the other items. At each step new $r^2$ were calculated for the rest of the items, and the elimination procedure repeated until all remaining items explained at least approximately 1% of the variance of the factor being predicted.

The first column in Table 72 lists the variables under four categories found to be significantly related either to transfer attitudes or transfer behaviors or both attitudes and behaviors. The second column provides standardized beta weights for the variables found to be the most important predictors of transfer attitudes; the third column provides the relative importance of each predictor variable by ranking them on the basis of their beta weights. Columns four and five provide the same information for transfer behaviors.

---

* Degree aspirations and primary reason for attending college were not entered into the regression equation.

Table 72
Predictors for transfer attitudes and behaviors.

| Predictor Variables | Beta for Transfer Attitude* | Beta Rank[1] | Beta for Transfer Behaviors* | Beta Rank[1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS | | | | |
| Age | -.15 | 1 | -.11 | 6 |
| Full-time Attendance | --- | | .26 | 1 |
| Income | --- | | .09 | 12 |
| Asian | --- | | .11 | 7 |
| ACADEMIC INTEGRATION | | | | |
| Taking detailed notes in class | .10 | 8 | --- | |
| Grade point average | .11 | 3 | --- | |
| Amount of study time | .10 | 6 | --- | |
| Number of textbooks read | --- | | .08 | 13 |
| Social science courses completed | --- | | .11 | 5 |
| College units completed | --- | | .13 | 4 |
| Take action when not doing well in course | --- | | .08 | 14 |
| Asked instructor for additional references on a topic of interest | --- | | .10 | 10 |
| Non-awareness of honors programs | --- | | -.09 | 8 |
| SOCIAL INTEGRATION | | | | |
| Participation in meetings with senior college recruiters | .09 | 9 | .15 | 3 |
| Importance of counselors as a source of information on transfer information | --- | | .16 | 2 |
| Non-awareness of senior application workshops | --- | | -.09 | 11 |
| Interaction with faculty | --- | | .10 | 9 |
| INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES | | | | |
| Self-rating in general education skills | .11 | 4 | --- | |
| Professional career plans | .10 | 5 | --- | |
| Lack of employment opportunities as important reason for enrolling in college | -.15 | 2 | --- | |
| Be with friends as important reason for attending college | -.10 | 7 | --- | |
| TOTAL $R^2$ | .16 | | .34 | |

*$p < .001$ for all predictors

[1] prior to rounding

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Demographic Characteristics. Of the four variables listed under this category, only one variable -- age -- was found to be a significant predictor of transfer attitudes; age was also significantly related to transfer behaviors. The negative relationship indicates that younger students are more likely than older students to show high transfer attitudes as well as high transfer behaviors. Age was found to be the most important predictor of transfer attitudes; in contrast it ranked sixth in importance for transfer behaviors.

Being Asian, attending college on a full-time basis, and having a high income were found to be positively related to high transfer behaviors. Full-time attendance ranked as the most important predictor of transfer behaviors.

Employment status and sex were not found to be significant predictors either of transfer attitudes or behaviors.

Academic Integration. The variables included under this category represent student commitment to educational goals and quality of effort. Under this category the variables found to be significant predictors of transfer attitudes are different from those that were found to be significantly related to transfer behaviors.

The variables found to be significant predictors of transfer attitudes in order of importance were: grade point average, amount of time dedicated to studying on a daily basis, and frequently taking detailed notes during class lectures. Six variables under this category were found to be predictors of transfer behaviors, they were: number of college units completed, number of social science courses completed, not being aware of honors programs (negative predictor), frequently asking instructor for additional references on a special topic of interest, number of assigned textbooks read, and taking action when not performing well in a course.

The greater number of variables as well as the type of variables found to be significant predictors of transfer behaviors appear to suggest that students who are high in transfer behaviors compared to students who are high in transfer attitudes may be more fully integrated into the academic environment. Additionally, the finding that number of units completed and number of social science courses completed are significant predictors of transfer behaviors but not of transfer attitudes strongly indicate that transfer behaviors are related to persistence.

Social Integration. Under this category only one variable -- participation in meetings with senior college recruiters -- was found to be a significant predictor of transfer attitudes. This variable was also found to be significantly related to transfer behaviors; however, the comparable ranking of this variable for transfer attitudes (9th) and for transfer behaviors (3rd) indicated that it is of greater importance as a predictor of behaviors than of attitudes. Three other variables under this category were found to be significant predictors of transfer behaviors, in order of importance they were: regarding counselors as an important source of information on transfer opportunities, frequent interaction with faculty, and non-awareness of workshops on how to complete senior college applications (negative predictor). The variable denoting

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interaction with faculty is a composite of three items: (1) frequently making appointment to see insturctor; (2) frequently asking faculty for advice on future plans; and (3) frequently having an informal conversation with instructor.

Again, the greater number and type of variables found to be significant predictors of transfer behaviors compared to transfer attitudes suggest that students with high transfer behaviors are also more fully integrated into the social environment.

Individual Attributes. Variables under this category were found to be significantly related to transfer attitudes only. They were: self-rating in general education skills, aspiring to a professional career, and indicating either lack of employment opportunities or to be with friends as important reasons for enrolling in college (negative predictors). Self-rating in general education skills was a composite of five items in which students rated themselves as poor, fair, good or excellent in their ability to (1) understand the implications of scientific and technological developments; (2) understand art, classical music, drama; (3) understand different political ideologies; (4) edit written material; and (5) use algebra to solve problems. By adding up the response choices given in each of the five items it was possible to derive an overall score for self-rating.

It is assumed that none of the variables under this category are significant predictors for transfer behaviors because they are not action-related.

The findings presented in this section show that there are nine significant predictor variables for transfer attitudes and fourteen for transfer behaviors.

There is strong indication in the findings that attitudes and behaviors may be to some extent the outcome of differences in the way individuals experience academic and social aspects of the college environment. For instance, students with high transfer behaviors appeared to be better integrated into the academic and social environment than students with high transfer attitudes. While this is an important finding, it must be noted that greater institutional integration among high transfer behavior students may be due to having been at the college for a longer period of time than students who score high on transfer attitudes (but not behaviors). The significant relationship found between transfer behaviors and number of college units completed as well as number of social science courses completed suggest that transfer behaviors may be strongly influenced by persistence.

Furthermore, the fact that there are some variables that are related to transfer attitudes but not to behaviors, and vice versa may be an indication that high transfer attitudes may not naturally evolve into high transfer behaviors. If there were a strong connection between transfer attitudes and behaviors, all or the majority of the variables entering into the regression equation would have been found to be significantly related both to attitudes and behaviors. However, only two variables out of a possible fourteen were found to be held in common by transfer attitudes and behaviors.

Predisposition to transfer has been examined in this section by looking at individual transfer attitudes and behaviors in relation to several independent variables. In the next section we provide a brief look at student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function.

## Student Perceptions of Institutional Performance of the Transfer Function

In doing the factor analysis to construct the two measures of student transfer attitudes and behaviors, a third factor was extracted. This factor which had three items with loadings of +/- .30 appeared to be measuring student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function. Therefore, a scale using the following three items was constructed:

(1) This college provides excellent information on transfer opportunities.

(2) Students who want to transfer get assistance from counselors with applications for admission and financial aids.

(3) Special services are provided for students who want to transfer to four-year colleges.

The three items were scored by assigning a score of five to strong agreement, a four to agreement, a three to neutral, and a two and 1, respectively to disagreement and strong disagreement. Students who had a total score of 12 or higher were labeled as having a high level of satisfaction vis-a-vis institutional performance of the transfer function while students with scores below 12 were labeled as having a low level of satisfaction. The distribution of scores showed that a score of 12 fell into the 75th percentile. Of the 1,545 students who responded to the items used in the measure, 73.2 percent were classified as having a low level of satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function, and 26.8 percent were judged to be highly satisfied. Among students aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree, 26% and 74% respectively showed to have high and low satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function. The data reported in this section is only for students who indicated aspiring to a B.A. or higher degree.

Differences in student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function were examined in relation to student participation in support services and sources of information on transfer opportunities considered important by students. Additionally, student perceptions of institutional performance of the transfer function were examined in relation to student transfer attitudes and behaviors.

## Student Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of the Transfer Function and Ethnicity

Asians showed to have the highest concentration of students (33.1%) highly satisfied with institutional performance of the transfer function. This finding was not unexpected since the concentration of Asian students with high transfer attitudes and behaviors was greater than for any of the other groups. White students (22%) had the lowest concentration of students highly satisfied with institutional performance of the transfer function. Table 73 shows the results for the four ethnic groups.

## Table 73

## Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance by Student Ethnicity

| | Satisfaction | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| Asians | 33.1 | 66.9 |
| Blacks | 26.9 | 73.1 |
| Hispanic | 24.6 | 75.4 |
| White | 22.4 | 77.6 |

### Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Transfer Attitudes/Behaviors

Students with high transfer attitudes and behaviors are more likely to be satisfied with institutional performance of the transfer function. Differences in satifaction levels are particularly marked between students with high transfer attitudes and high transfer behaviors. Among high transfer attitude students, 30% showed a high level of satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function as opposed to 39% among high transfer behavior students.

Table 74

Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance in relation to Student Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors

| Transfer Attitudes and Behaviors | Satisfaction | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| Attitudes | | |
| High | 29.5 | 70.5 |
| Low | 21.3 | 78.7 |
| Behaviors | | |
| High | 38.7 | 61.3 |
| Low | 23.3 | 76.7 |

## Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Sources of Information on Transfer Opportunities

Students who indicated that counselors and teachers were a very important source of information regarding transfer opportunities were also more likely to have favorable perceptions of institutional performance of the transfer function than students who indicated that these sources were not important. For example, 41 percent of the students who are satisfied with the institution's performance of the transfer function reported that counselors were an important source of information, whereas among students who indicated that counselors were not an important source of transfer information, only 12 percent showed satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function. Similarly, among students who said that teachers were an important source of information on transfer opportunities, 36% appeared to be highly satisfied with institutional performance of the transfer function as opposed to 14%

among students who said teachers were not an important source of information.

Table 75

Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Important Sources of Information on Transfer Opportunities

| Sources of Information on Transfer Opportunities | Satisfaction | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| Counselors | | |
| Very Important | 40.9 | 59.1 |
| Not Important | 12.2 | 87.8 |
| Teachers | | |
| Very Important | 36.3 | 63.7 |
| Not Important | 14.1 | 85.9 |

## Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance and Participation in Support Services

Table 76 below shows that students who report having participated in general support services activities as well as in specific activities related to transfer preparation (Table 77) consistently show more satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function.

## Table 76

## Satisfaction with Transfer Function Performance in relation to Participation in Support Service Activities

| Participation in Support Services | Satisfaction | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| Academic Counseling | | |
| Yes | 29.8 | 70.2 |
| No | 22.1 | 77.9 |
| Career Counseling | | |
| Yes | 34.8 | 65.2 |
| No | 21.1 | 78.9 |
| Study Group | | |
| Yes | 28.9 | 71.1 |
| No | 25.3 | 74.7 |
| Freshman Orientation | | |
| Yes | 31.0 | 69.0 |
| No | 23.5 | 76.5 |
| Study Skills Workshop | | |
| Yes | 31.3 | 68.8 |
| No | 24.8 | 75.2 |
| Honors Program | | |
| Yes | 31.5 | 68.5 |
| No | 25.1 | 74.9 |

## Table 77

## Satisfaction with Performance of the Transfer Function in relation to Participation in Transfer Activities

| Participation in Transfer Activities | Satisfaction | |
|---|---|---|
| | High | Low |
| Transfer Orientation | | |
| Yes | 39.5 | 60.5 |
| No | 23.1 | 76.9 |
| Meeting with Senior College Recruiters | | |
| Yes | 36.1 | 63.9 |
| No | 23.1 | 76.9 |
| Workshops on Completing Senior College Applications | | |
| Yes | 44.3 | 55.7 |
| No | 23.4 | 76.6 |

The data presented in the table above clearly show that students who participated in transfer-related activities are much more likely than students who do not participate to have favorable attitudes towards institutional performance of the transfer function. The biggest difference in satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function is among students who report having participated in senior application workshops, they are twice as likely to show high satisfaction than students who have not participated.

## Summary Discussion

The findings reported in this study suggest above all that degree aspirations among community college students are not a good measure of transfer predisposition. This is not to deny the importance of degree aspirations, but rather to stress that in the absence of transfer-specific attitudinal and behavioral attributes, verbal expression for a baccalaureate or higher degree may be meaningless as an indicator of transfer intent. This conclusion is supported by the finding that among the 74% of students who reported planning on earning a baccalaureate or higher degree; 54% appeared to exhibit high transfer attitudes; and a much smaller proportion, 16%, appeared to be engaged in overt acts that would lend meaningfulness to high degree aspirations. Similar findings were obtained in studies done in the Los Angeles Community College District in 1979-1980 (ERIC Topical Paper 75, ED214578).

To avoid the possibility of misunderstanding, it should be noted that the usefulness of the attitudinal and behavioral transfer measures does not lie in their power to predict a college's expected rate of student transfer. The measures are valuable as heuristic tools in that they brought to light student attributes underlying transfer predisposition rarely addressed in studies of community college students.

Close inspection of the attitudinal and behavioral attributes revealed that not all students exhibit the same level nor the same apsects of transfer predisposition. For instance, some students exhibited high transfer attitudes and behaviors, while others had high transfer attitudes but not high transfer behaviors. These differences across students make a strong case for the importance of developing multiple strategies to increase transfer opportunities, specifically adapted to individual needs.

Counseling services are considered central to the process of preparing students for transfer; however, the kinds of counseling services appropriate for a student who aspires to a B.A. degree but shows attitudes that are inconsistent with his/her degree aspirations may be different from counseling services that should be made available to students whose behaviors, rather than attitudes, are inconsistent with degree aspirations.

Clearly, before community colleges can consider alternative ways of diversifying transfer-related services, they will first need to implement processes to identify differences in student attributes at the point of entry. In other words, a process of "coding" students according to predisposition to transfer. This suggestion may raise some objections because it may appear as a form of tracking or cooling-out students; however, in view of the great diversity in the educational goals of students community colleges attract the importance of defining student populations and their salient characteristics cannot be overlooked.

Differences in prediposition to transfer are partly due to past educational experiences; with some exceptions, it is safe to surmise that by and large the majority of UCCTOP college students have attended high schools in poor urban areas that may not have had high quality college preparatory programs. Many of the students may have decided late in their high school career to give college a try. Others might have a few years gap between high school graduation and the time they enrolled in college. The effect of past educational experience on predisposition to transfer notwithstanding, when the attitudinal and behavioral transfer measures were examined in relation to other independent variables it became evident that differences in transfer predisposition are to some extent a manifestation of student integration in the institutional academic and social environment.

Studies of drop-out behaviors among college students (Spady, 1970; Tinto, 1975) have shown that persisters, in contrast to drop-outs, are more successful in achieving integration into the college's academic and social systems. Further, these studies posit that integration is influenced by a student's initial commitment to the goal of completing college and to the the college of attendance.

Our findings show that variables associated with measures of institutional integration into the academic system (e.g., grade point average) and the social system (e.g., interaction with faculty) were statistically significant predictors of transfer behaviors in particular, and to a lesser extent, of transfer attitudes as well. Stated more simply, students who appear indifferent to or disengaged from the academic and social systems of the college are not as likely as their more involved counterparts to develop high transfer attitudes and behaviors. Additionally, for students who have high transfer attitudes the chances that these will be translated into high transfer behaviors may be lessened by marginal integration into the institution's social system.

The interdependent nature between transfer predisposition and institutional integration disclosed by our findings reinforce the notion, brought up in the section on the faculty, that qualitative aspects are as, if not more, important than the procedural aspects of the transfer function. Qualitative aspects of the transfer function involve institutional efforts to foster an academic and social environment that will have an accentuating effect on students with high transfer predisposition and a compensatory effect on students with low transfer predisposition.

Awareness of qualitative aspects is particularly critical in community colleges with student populations that are predominantly from minority backgrounds. As shown in this study, black and Hispanic students relative to Asians and whites are less likely to exhibit high transfer predisposition. This finding may reflect a failure of community colleges to recognize that initial transfer predisposition among these students is lower than for other groups, and that institutional climate conditions may inhibit the type of involvement in the academic and social systems most likely to induce an increase in transfer predisposition.

Ultimately, involvement in learning is an individual responsibility; however, institutional values influence individual commitment to educational goals and the quality of effort the individual invests in his education. The comprehensive character of community colleges, however, may be an inexorable obstacle to the elaboration of institutional values that are fundamental to the transfer function. Multiple and unrelated functions in community colleges, as well as diversity in student educational goals, may make it difficult to justify singling out transfer education as an institutional priority. Moreover, from an institutional leadership perspective, to do so may be perceived as a strategy that could endanger institutional survival in that it may reduce the institution's flexibility to take advantage of other student markets.

In light of these issues, the question that must be raised is whether community colleges can promote institutional values that are supportive of the transfer function without giving up or reducing functions that might be essential to their survival. Or, put another way: Is it possible for community colleges to simultaneously make their internal environments adaptable to dissimilar functions?

An answer to this question may be found in "Janusian thinking," which Cameron (1983) explains as holding two contradictory thoughts to be true simultaneously. Applying this concept to organizational adaptation to changes in the external enviornment, he describes "Janusian institutions" as those able to increase adaptability by maintaining at the same time two opposing characteristics, e.g., high specialization and high generalization or loose and tight coupling.

While the concern here is not with institutional adaptation to the external environment, "Janusian thinking" suggests a new and different way of approaching the problems raised. One way in which community colleges can engage in "Janusian thinking" is by juxtaposing competing functions and visualizing environmental qualities most conducive to each. Using contemplation as a planning device might suggest a number of ways whereby special environments adapted to different functions could be created without necessarily having to resort to a major reorganization of the institution.

For instance, if cohesiveness is seen as an important property of the transfer environment, it could be accomplished in several ways: assigning a select group of faculty to teach required introductory courses while at the same time designating them as advisors/mentors of potential transfer students; scheduling small group counseling sessions for potential transfer students that can serve as a vehicle of developing a transfer student culture; forming special study groups for potential transfer students; sponsoring a series of lectures on transfer-related topics.

In some community colleges several or all of these things may be already taking place but as discrete activities, rather than as part of a total approach to obtain environmental properties that are consistent with the transfer mission. The findings reported in this study and the interpretations derived therein represent an effort to begin defining the underlying properties of transfer education; the new knowledge acquired by the UCCTOP colleges throughout their participation in the Foundation's program will lead us to new discoveries and to a more complete understanding of the issues raised throughout this report.

# CHAPTER SEVEN:
# THE COLLEGE PROJECTS

Each of the 24 funded colleges engaged in a number of activities to promote transfer. Some revised counseling procedures, student support services, or curriculum. Others focused on program articulation or student recruitment activities between college and high school or college and receiving institution. In this section of the report we analyze and evaluate these various efforts to increase transfer opportunities for minority students. The analysis was made by reviewing each of the 24 documents submitted to the Ford Foundation as the institutions' final reports or, in a few cases, the interim report. A grade was assigned to each report based on the quality of the work done for the project, the apparent accuracy of the report, and the attempts described to institutionalize project activities in the future.

Two factors seem to characterize this Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program (UCCTOP) to stimulate transfer from two-year colleges to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. One is that the projects were tremendously diversified, despite the fact that all 24 institutions were two-year colleges in urban areas, and all had high percentages of ethnic minority students--some almost total ethnic enrollments. The second condition is the enthusiasm with which most of the projects seem to have been met. While in some cases this spirit seemed to be somewhat specious or contrived, in most instances it appeared sincere. Whether the enthusiasm is perpetuated after the Ford funding period terminated for 19 of these colleges remains to be seen. An assessment of this will be made after the total UCCTOP has been completed.

Another issue that needs time to assess and further study is the degree to which the UCCTOP stimulated other related but independent projects. One institution, Roxbury Community College, received a simultaneous award, a three year grant from the Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust to improve articulation and transfer between RCC and four local colleges. La Guardia Community College has more recently received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to increase transfer rates between that institution and Vassar College, a project coordinated by the Association of American Colleges. J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College received a $10,000 grant from the CSX Corporation, a company recently located in Richmond and committed to developing the inner city. This award is to challenge JSR alumni in their fund raising campaign.

Although it is not directly tied to a single institution and certainly not amenable to establishing a cause and effect relationship, the University of California has increased both its interest in transfer students and its efforts in obtaining them. Several hundred thousand dollars have been set aside for this effort, and transfer administrators have been assigned to UCLA and UC Berkeley. And finally, Laney College (California) stated in its report that the Ford project has caused a definite "ripple effect", with other community colleges and feeder high schools expressing interest regarding the transfer phenomenon.

The variety of projects within the total Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities program was mentioned earlier. The following table presents the breakdown of major activities within the 24 colleges. 'Proposed' refers to those activities that were indicated in the colleges' original proposals to Ford, while 'actual' represents activities in which the colleges did in fact engage. Interestingly, it appears that more activities were conducted than originally proposed, with 31 proposed and 72 actually conducted.

## TABLE 78
## PROPOSED AND ACTUAL MAJOR ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN 24 FORD UCCTOP INSTITUTIONS

| | Strengthen Courses/ Curriculum | | Recruitment/ Articulation | | Special Activities For Selected Students | | Testing/ Tracking | | Alumni Involvement | | Tutorials Counseling/ Student Services | | No. of Major Activities in which Colleges Actually Participated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PROP. | ACTUAL | PROP. | ACTUAL | PROP. | ACTUAL | PROP. | ACTUAL | PROP. | ACTUAL | PROP. | ACTUAL | |
| Baltimore | X | X | | X | | X | | | | | X | X | 4 |
| Bronx | | | | X | | X | | | | | X | X | 3 |
| Compton | X | | X | X | | X | | | | | | | 2 |
| *Cuyahoga | | | X | X | | | | X | | | | | 2 |
| Highland Park | | | X | X | | X | X | X | | | | X | 4 |
| Honolulu | | X | X | X | | | | X | | | | X | 4 |
| Hostos | | X | | | | X | X | X | | | | | 3 |
| Houston | | | | | X | X | | X | | | | X | 3 |
| Jefferson | | X | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | 4 |
| *La Guardia | | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | X | X | 4 |
| Laney | | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | X | 4 |
| Lawson State | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | 4 |
| L.A. City | | X | | X | X | | | | | | | | 2 |
| L.A. Harbor | | | | X | X | | X | X | | | | | 2 |
| L.A. Mission | | | | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | 4 |
| *Miami-Dade | | | | X | | | | X | X | X | | X | 4 |
| *Philadelphia | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Reynolds | | | | | | X | | | X | X | | | 2 |
| Roxbury | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Sacramento | | | | X | X | X | | X | | | | X | 4 |
| San Diego | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | X | 3 |
| *So. Mountain | | X | | | X | X | | | | | | | 2 |
| State | | X | | X | | | | | X | | | | 2 |
| West L.A. | | | | | | X | | X | | X | X | | 3 |
| | 5 | 10 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 72 |

*UCCTOP Phase II - Funded Institutions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In reviewing the reports as a whole, it is interesting to note the distribution of ratings among these projects. Each report was analyzed in a subjective way, being viewed as a projective protocol. An attempt was made to "see behind the words," to understand exactly what had been accomplished, what was genuine, and what was an attempt to present a positive picture, to "look good." The extent to which the project would be continued was also assessed. The single grade assigned to each report was A, B, or C. A describes an excellent effort and an 'honest' report, B suggests an average report with some activities accomplished and/or some efforts being made to institutionalize the proceedings, and C identifies an obvious attempt at "looking good" on paper, rather than actually achieving the project's original objectives, and/or a minimal level of accomplishment.

Following is a college-by-college assessment of UCCTOP Phase I activities.

## Table 79

## RATINGS OF UCCTOP REPORTS

| | | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Baltimore Community College | x | | |
| 2. | Bronx Community College | | | x |
| 3. | Compton College | | x | |
| *4. | Cuyahoga Community College | | x | |
| 5. | Highland Park Community College | x | | |
| 6. | Honolulu Community College | x | | |
| 7. | Hostos Community College | | x | |
| 8. | Houston Community College | | x | |
| 9. | Jefferson Community College | x | | |
| *10. | La Guardia Community College | x | | |
| 11. | Laney College | x | | |
| 12. | Lawson State Community College | | | x |
| 13. | Los Angeles City College | x | | |
| 14. | Los Angeles Harbor College | | x | |
| 15. | Los Angeles Mission College | | x | |
| *16. | Miami-Dade Community College | x | | |
| *17. | Philadelphia Community College | | x | |
| 18. | J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College | x | | |
| 19. | Roxbury Community College | | x | |
| 20. | Sacramento City College | | x | |
| 21. | San Diego City College | x | | |
| *22. | South Mountain Community College | x | | |
| 23. | State Community College | | | x |
| 24. | West Los Angeles College | | | x |
| | Total N=24 | 11 | 9 | 4 |

*Funded for Phase II UCCTOP

Rating = A

## #1 BALTIMORE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Community College of Baltimore's project focused on the concept of the community college as a bridge between the feeder high schools and receiver baccalaureate institutions. Three major objectives were included in this project:

1. The first objective was the formulation of an Advisory Task Force, an umbrella group that concerns itself with articulation between five feeder high schools and the Community College of Baltimore.
2. The second objective was internal to the college: curriculum revision, the development of articulation agreements with the high schools and the baccalaureate institutions, and the development of two competency-based arts and sciences courses.
3. Objective three was the development of an Arts and Sciences Student Identification Process that would identify potential arts and sciences students, the formation of a Community College of Baltimore arts and science support system team, and the development of transfer opportunities to baccalaureate institutions.

All three major objectives appear to have been met. The Transfer Task Force, an advisory group, decided to continue work during the 1984-85 academic year, scheduling its initial meeting for September 1984. Although subsequent reports are not available as to whether this and further meetings have or are taking place, this does suggest a continuation of efforts.

The computerized high school codes for the Community College of Baltimore were revised and coupled with curriculum codes. Completion course levels were also identified, and career awareness workshops were conducted.

The second major activity involved approximately 80 professionals from the five feeder high schools and an estimated 400 hours of time spent in articulation activities. Two competency-based arts and sciences courses in English and biology were developed. Recommendations were also made regarding the placement of the entire Arts and Sciences program in a competency-based format.

The third activity involved 90 professionals from four participating baccalaureate colleges (Morgan State University, Coppin State College, Towson State College, and the University of Baltimore). These people represented administration, academic affairs, and student affairs.

The Community College of Baltimore report notes that it has made "a major commitment to institutionalize the progress made during the grant period; yet this is only a beginning, a first step." In reviewing this final report, the CCB project seems to represent a sincere effort with a good chance of continuance. It appears to have involved a number of people, both within the college and in the feeder high schools and receiving institutions. Although it was not built on previous efforts, which might better insure continuation, the number of people involved and the extent of the activities conducted deserve a rating of A for excellence, sincerity, and continuation efforts.

Rating = C

## #2 BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This project focused on three objectives that were met by various activities, the combination of "disparate pieces into a cohesive program designed to increase the transfer possibilities of students at Bronx Community College."

Objective one was the improvement of student information systems. An electronic version of the student handbook was produced and will be accessible at various campus sites as well as in Bronx's Instructional Computer Center. The System for Interactive Guidance and Information (S.I.G.I.) was also installed, and pilot tested on about 60 freshmen.

The second objective set by this college was to redesign and strengthen the transfer advisement and liaison systems. A Transfer Officer position was established, and 325 potential transfer students who had completed at least 45 credits were contacted. This same officer established liaisons with five baccalaureate-granting institutions, and the possibility was discussed of establishing transfer officer positions at each of the CUNY units.

Objective three was to strengthen the academic program. The college attempted to block program 100 students with academic deficiencies in developmental reading, writing, and mathematics courses as well as a required orientation course and a college level communications course. Due to some registration problems and a smaller entering spring class than anticipated, only 29 students were block programmed. Retention rates increased for these 29, and the report indicates the intention to repeat this experiment with more students is noted in the report. Two faculty members were trained in Strategies for Teaching and Reinforcing Skills (STARS).

In addition, a prototypical synchronized micro-computer-activated videotape was prepared, which was supported in part by Project Arise, a National Science Foundation funded project. This bilingual videotape dealt with the breathing rate of goldfish--hardly a program designed to increase transfer rates! However, Bronx intends to approach the Annenberg Foundation for support in producing a videodisc version of this experiment. And finally, to meet this objective, two consultants were hired to assist the English department in the teaching of writing through the use of computers.

While this report emphasizes the "disparate activities" contained in the project, the attempts at cohesion seem not to have been achieved. This project dipped here and there, with only a vague sense of direction. The report makes few references to continuing efforts, other than the suggestion regarding possible funding from the Annenberg Foundation. It is assigned a rating of C.

Rating= B

## #3 COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Project ACCT (Access for Community College Transfer) was developed as Compton College's comprehensive approach to assist its working class black and Latino students. Its "four-pronged, multi-faceted outreach component (was) designed to provide information on postsecondary education" to a broad range of potential college and university bound students.

This project articulated agreements with three unified school districts to establish an outreach program in both junior and senior high schools. Phase I, early outreach, was implemented in all of the 11 junior high schools in the College's district; Phase II, intermediate outreach, focused on five public and two private high schools; Phase III, an on-campus or immediate outreach strategy aimed at multiplying the number of Compton College transfer students; and Phase IV, community outreach, enlisted the support of local ministry to mobilize members of their congregations to seek college and university educations.

Students, parents, counselors, faculty, and community residents engaged in College and University Information Workshops, which stressed various goals and benefits of postsecondary education. These workshops emphasized the education of junior and senior high school professional staff members as well as Compton College staff. Workshops and tours of Compton's campus involved 86 faculty members and 37 counselors from seven high schools.

In addition, a series of Parent Workshops was designed to provide information and to encourage parents in developing home environments conducive to long range academic growth. These included hints on developing proper study habits, improving basic skills, and strengthening writing and reading abilities. These "workshops provide parents, the majority of whom have never gone to college, with a structure and strategy which encourages and facilitates active involvement in their childrens work, plans, and aspirations."

Other activities included a series of student workshops and programs; visits to secondary school classrooms by faculty, counselors, and administrators; involvement in a consortium with neighboring universities; sponsorship of a series of College/University Information Days; and distribution of flyers and posters to junior and senior high school campuses, local churches, and such central community locations as libraries and parks.

This college's report describes efforts that it would like to institute in a long lasting comprehensive program. A whole list of "will do's" were included in the report. These are well and good, the report suggesting that more was done during the Ford project than originally proposed. However, since President Abel Sykes has left Compton for another college, it is questionable whether this institution has the ability and/or willingness to continue these efforts. This report is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = B

## #4 CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This project focused on four major objectives that were addressed by a Steering Committee and four subcommittees. These major objectives were to 1) develop, in conjunction with the receiving institutions, process and criteria for determining specific course transferability; 2) address the problems of academic preparation by working with area secondary schools and four-year institutions to define three vocational/technical curricula that would enhance student readiness for a two-year college program and eventual transfer to a linking career program; 3) identify 130 students to participate in counseling, advising, and special program activities to enhance their transfer to a four-year institution; and 4) develop an assessment plan utilizing the College Board Scholastic Aptitude and Career Skills Assessment test.

Perhaps the major strength of this project was the involvement of a number of people from feeder high schools, the college staff, and receiving institutions. The Steering Committee was composed of representatives from Cuyahoga Community College, 12 secondary and four-year institutions, and five centers involved in science studies. Charged with general supervision of the project, the Steering Committee's efforts were augmented by four subcommittees on Transfer, Curricular Ladders, Counseling/Special Programs, and Assessment. Although the formation of these committees "ate into" some time, the College considered the activities worthwhile because "the initial and continuing enthusiasm of the external representatives... has been and will be essential to the long-range impact, expansion, extension, and lasting institutionalization of the effort."

Plans for continuing these efforts and institutionalizing the project were cited in the report. One weakness of the project, however, is the fact that the Steering Committee and the subcommittees are all external to the college. It would appear more positive if the college had designated one person as over-all coordinator, even though the project seems to be feasible as a continuing and worthwhile effort, this report is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = A

## #5 HIGHLAND PARK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

In its report to the Foundation, Highland Park pretty well sums up much of UCCTOP's impact by stating, "The Ford Foundation Grant has served to add prestige and impetus to the transfer function both internally and throughout the higher education community in the state." The remainder of the report is equally straightforward and succinct, with appendices serving to expand and document statements - a joy after reviewing so many convoluted and self-aggrandizing reports!

Highland Park's three major objectives were to 1) identify potential transfer students and develop a student data base information system that would lead to improved support services; 2) upgrade counseling and instructional services to identified students in order to raise achievement levels, clarify transfer goals, and facilitate transition to a four-year institution; and 3) recruit potential transfer students from local high schools. In order to achieve these objectives, six activities were undertaken:

1. A student assessment program was initiated for all first time students. Data gathered were used for regular course placement in developmental/remedial courses and for counseling purposes.

2. The colleges engaged in several activities with both "receiver" colleges and "feeder" high schools. Approximately 300 Highland Park students visited seven

baccalaureate-granting institutions, and meetings were held on Highland Park's campus with people representing nine four-year colleges and universities. HPCC also signed several new articulation agreements (number not indicated).

3. The existing honors program was expanded. Over 300 students were honored at the Spring Honors Convocation, 49 students were initiated into Phi Theta Kappa (national two-year college honorary society) and students participated in several career and professional interest day seminars.
4. A Work Study/Cooperative Education Experiences Program was established to strengthen academic skills.
5. Counseling and instructional services were upgraded. The counseling staff developed and utilized personalized student profiles that included testing data and a complete transcript of HPCC courses. Students were also given individual program advisement.
6. College personnel visited 35 feeder high schools to disseminate information regarding admissions programs and to recruit students.

Several allusions were made in this report to activities that would continue beyond the project's funding period. The report appears not to be written to merely impress Ford and thus seek further funding but in a straightforward, apparently sincere accounting of activities. It deserves an A in all respects.

Rating = A

# #6 HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Honolulu Community College concentrated its project on four major activities:

1. Developing an articulation course, Transfer Decisions, to assist students in their transition from a two-year to a four-year college or university;
2. Piloting a computer course, Introduction to College Computer Study Skills, that was designed to introduce transfer students to microcomputer usage;
3. Developing a prototype Transfer Terminal with a transfer information database accessible to students, faculty, and student services staff; and
4. Developing the conceptual design for an automated Student Tracking System.

These four components related to the achievement of seven objectives. All except one of the 19 individual activities falling under these major objectives were completed at the time the project report was submitted; the development of a "strategy and schedule for future articulation" was to have been completed in summer 1984.

The development and installation of the Transfer Terminal appears particularly successful--a portable advisement tool that can be used in both small educational settings and in various outreach activities. This terminal allows potential transfer students to determine credits that are acceptable for transfer to any four-year institution for which articulation agreements exist, as well as to determine students' "best mix" of their college courses with four-year degree requirements. Other activities seem to have been well conducted but do not appear as interesting as these.

In general, this report seems to be dealing with objectives, devices, agreements, and some curricular development--but not with people directly. This is not necessarily a negative - these efforts eventually will affect students--but it is interesting because it differs markedly from most of the other UCCTOP projects. Actually, this type of approach may prove to be especially good because it might well have a permanent life of its own. Because of this very element, this report deserves a rating of A.

Rating - B

## #7 HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Four objectives were designated in Hostos' project, which was conceptualized "as a way to integrate desired and existing projects in academic student services and administrative areas into a logical and comprehensive system of progression and support from initial student entry to four-year college transfer."

Activities were divided into three areas--student services, academic, and administrative support. These included:

1. The development of a computerized system for identifying and following up the liberal arts transfer population. This system was implemented by counselors who conducted an orientation course and administered to its students a specially developed survey. A volunteer Faculty Liberal Arts Advisement Corps was also recruited, and these instructors were trained to work with potential liberal arts transfers;
2. The development and piloting of a curriculum for "Futures: Transfer Seminar", a follow-up course to the freshman orientation course;
3. Completion of Course Equivalency Listings, an articulation check-list, for three targeted four-year CUNY colleges;
4. Discussions by liberal arts department chairpersons, who were organized into the Faculty Audit Task Force, regarding the transferability of courses. Transfer tracks were

developed by area or discipline;

5. Development of a profile of Liberal Arts Honors Students by the Honors Committee. Syllabi for eight proposed Honors Courses were developed;
6. The design, piloting, and refinement of a survey instrument to assist in identifying potential transfer students;
7. Development of a Degree Requirement Checklist (DRC) in which all data were converted to machine-readable forms for computer analysis;
8. Creation of a file to capture information on student perceptions of the institution, current career and educational goals, and changes in goals.

Although these activities seem worthwhile, the absence of specification, makes it difficult to determine the extent to which objectives were actually met. The report suggests that plans for institutionalizing these activities require maintenance and expansion. It would seem that the project activities could do both--maintain themselves and expand--with little effort. However, the vagueness and general tone of the report imply they will not be continued. The project is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = B

## #8 HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Houston's program was to facilitate the "transferability needs" of 110 minority students through academic advisement and support services. Two of HCCS's 28 campuses were selected to implement this program.

Fifty (50) Hispanic and 60 black students were selected on the basis of academic achievement, commitment, and educational background Each participant was given an individual academic advisement plan -- values clarification, goal setting, interest inventories, career information, and other interests. A career profile was then drawn to further assist the student in explaining career goals and choices.

A student profile folder was also developed and maintained for the 110 participants, each of whom met with a Counselor/Manager at least monthly. This folder consisted of seven types of materials: pre-assessment results; an academic advisement plan; career profile plan; progress notes; degree plan; student questionnaire; and such related materials as financial forms, reading assessment scores, and transcripts.

This was truly a hands-on project. Pre-post assessments of self concept were made for 82% of the students (to date of report), using The Edwards Personal Preference Scale. At the time the report was submitted, 80% of the 110 students had increased their self concept, 94% had declared a major and filed an educational plan, and 80% were considered likely to increase their selection opportunities to four-year colleges by participating in several local and out-of-town campus activities. It was expected that by August, 1984, 80% of all graduating minority participants would have successfully transferred. However, since the actual number of graduating participants was eight, obviously this figure is too small to be a very forceful indicator.

By August, 1984 a joint program was to be initiated with the University of Houston. A Ford Advisory Committee was established, consisting of 16 HCCS faculty and staff, graduates, and senior institution representatives. Plans were laid for continuation of this program, but a strong plea for Ford funding was made in order to do so. Therefore, while this very personal approach is useful, it does not seem that it will become an established function because Houston was not granted UCCTOP Phase II funds. This report is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = A

## #9 JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The primary purpose of Jefferson's program was to provide accurate transfer information for 25 students that would assist them in subsequently completing the transfer process. Four approaches were utilized to achieve this project's goals:

1. Design of an in-depth orientation course and program to prepare students to handle the transfer process;
2. Establishment of an information system to familiarize students with the resources of four-year institutions and the benefits of the baccalaureate degree;
3. Identification of receiver institution professional support personnel to assist in student transition;
4. Development of "an effective interface system" with Kentucky State University in order to use existing support systems for minority students.

These goals appear to have been met successfully. The report not only describes activities but also presents hard data--a welcome change from so many of these 24 reports that allude to actual numbers vaguely, if at all. Twenty-five (25) students with at least 25 credit hours enrolled in a sexteen week, three hour credit Transfer Orientation Course. Theory learned in the classroom was applied in the field through the use of "A Scavenger Hunt" an activity which apparently was described in an Appendix but was not included in materials sent to the Center.

A pre-post transfer test was developed and administered to the 25 students. This instrument, consisting of 32 items, was divided into three goals: Academic Awareness, Personal Awareness, and Social Awareness. Results of the testing suggested that students gained knowledge of the transfer process as well as awareness of alternatives in selecting four-year institutions. A second pilot group of 17 students participated in a Freshman Orientation class as an add-on.

Transfer intervention strategies included three transfer workshops, classroom presentations, and individual counseling. A standardized format for follow-up studies was developed in order to obtain comparable data across institutions. Data derived from a Student Transfer Questionnaire and Institutional Student Transfer Questionnaire provided the bases for this activity. Unfortunately, neither the questionnaire nor findings were included in this report.

The follow-up support system developed for transfer students included curriculum guides, a checklist of requirements, and helpful hints. Professional resource mentors from four receiver institutions were identified, and a Transfer Task Force Advisory Committee was established. This could certainly be the basis for continuing activities.

It seems useful to quote directly from Jefferson's report:

> In developing a comprehensive advising and counseling program for transfer students, there has been more progress made in the last (9) months with Jefferson's Transfer Opportunities Program than there has been made in the last (9) years. The Ford Foundation Grant served as a catalyst in making plans become a reality. It enabled Jefferson to design and implement a transfer program that is built on a solid foundation, thus

> serving as a permanent service model. This is partly because of the resources, but it is also due to the prestige and endorsement of the Ford Foundation which lends credibility and commitment statewide to Jefferson's efforts.

Bellarmine College and the University of Kentucky allocated transfer scholarships for 32 minority students. The U. of K. scholarships were to be awarded to 15 high school graduates admitted to Jefferson Community College for fall 1984, and to 15 sophomores enrolled at Jefferson who plan to transfer to the U. of K. "This is particularly pertinent in that the University of Kentucky, Jefferson's Parent Institution, was not the focus of the proposal. Therefore, this gesture appears to be an overt move to compete for Jefferson's minority transfer students now that they are in the limelight with the Transfer Opportunities Program and the state's Desegregation Plan."

These passages from Jefferson's report appear to sum up this institution's efforts. Although the appendices would have been useful, and although the number of students involved is small, this effort warrants an A. The report was most direct, and plans for continuation were outlined clearly.

Rating = A

## #10 LA GUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The first paragraph of this report effectively summarizes some of the meanings and impact of UCCTOP. It is worth quoting in full:

> In September 1983, La Guardia Community College received a $25,000 grant from Ford Foundation's Urban Community Colleges Transfer Opportunity Program. The project has had a pervasive impact on the College and has brought it a new direction. Now, wherever we look--the classrooms, the co-op program, student services--transfer is a focus of conversation and concentration. Whether the times were right, or the prestige was high, or the morale needed boosting, or the Foundation was uncommonly prescient, the project has generated more `bang for the buck' than any other grant in our history--we suspect up to four times the dollar value ($100,000 in staff time and resources). And faculty have been energized to submit proposals to other funding sources to further enlarge the transfer thrust.

La Guardia's original proposal established three primary program objectives and two subsidiary objectives. All focused on what this institution perceives as the major problem surrounding the issue of transfer: students' lack of clarity about continuing their education; the benefits of so doing; and their options for planning, financing, and obtaining the baccalaureate. Eight UCCTOP achievements emphasize this concentration--the first five reflecting the explicit objectives of the proposal and the last three pertaining to the broadened scope of the project.

These eight achievements include:

1. Development and testing of a model to provide students with basic transfer information;

2. Involvement of the corporate community in the project;
3. Development of a model of the option of transfer to a selective, private, residential college -- a model that could be replicated with other types of four-year institutions;
4. Collection of both qualitative and base line data on transfer to assess the projects' impact;
5. Involvement of wide participation and diverse perspectives in the project;
6. Strengthening the structure for transfer counseling;
7. Increased articulation with four-year colleges; and
8. Creation of a framework for a comprehensive, college-wide transfer system.

Many more students than the 150 originally proposed were involved in testing La Guardia's structural and comprehensive model. A combined curriculum and advisement component to help students plan their future education was developed and incorporated into the college's cooperative education program. This sequenced curriculum was introduced in the initial co-op preparation course, broadened in a subsequent seminar, and reinforced in one-to-one advisement conferences. Introductory materials designed for the co-op program and materials for advisement conferences were piloted with nearly 400 students. The co-op seminar was piloted with 239 students, with eight faculty members teaching the eight different sections.

In addition, employers from four nationally known companies (IBM, Pfizer, McGraw Hill, and Merrill Lynch) helped students by providing guidance, tuition reimbursement, and incentives for promotion. La Guardia and Vassar College developed a special transfer agreement in which faculty, students, and administrators from both institutions were involved in formal exchanges and meetings. Involved La Guardia faculty developed a profile to select potential Vassar applicants, designed a referral system, disseminated this information, identified a pool of potential students, and discussed an inventory system. La Guardia and Vassar will be working on an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation-funded project, which is being coordinated by the American Association of Colleges. This appears to be a direct result of the Ford UCCTOP grant.

Most of La Guardia's project objectives have already been institutionalized, and plans for continuation are established. This report deserves the highest rating possible--A++!

Rating = A

# #11 LANEY COLLEGE

This institution proposed to establish an intervention strategy that would improve students' academic performance and persistence, increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions, and increase faculty awareness of transfer problems. A project director was designated, a college advisory committee was formed to provide guidance and information, and several activities were conducted to achieve the four major objectives described in this evaluation.

Objective one was to create a community of transfer students focusing on academic excellence and providing peer support. Five study groups of six to eight students each were established for English, calculus, and intermediate algebra. Each group met four to six hours weekly with a facilitator--an upper division or graduate student from a local university. Course instructors and facilitators met regularly to coordinate concepts, homework assignments, and information.

Objective two consisted of academic advisement and orientation for this group of students. Students entering a study group were interviewed and given a placement test.

Objective three was to monitor students' academic programs and provide additional study skills workshops for those with special academic needs. The project director and program specialist followed students' progress, consulted with study group facilitators, interviewed students individually, and observed and monitored study group activities. All of these activities represented direct hands-on approaches to assist the 30 to 40 students involved in the study groups.

The fourth objective differs from the previous ones in that it deals with articulation rather than directly with potential transfer students. Ties were established between Laney College's UCCTOP and the University of California at Berkeley's Offices of Relations with Schools and Admissions, as well as with similar offices of two state universities. A resource group was established at Laney to formalize these relationships.

A total of 32 students participated in these hands-on activities. Eighty-one percent (81%) of these students were attending classes at the time the Laney report was submitted, and 65% were participating in their study groups. In addition to this coterie of students, workshops comprised of a total of 17 students met three hours weekly. These workshops were designed to help students assess and improve study skills, use study times efficiently, become aware of campus support services, and "maneuver within the institutional system."

A series of 11-one hour informational sessions was also presented. Focusing on study skills, academic and support services, and transfer requirements, these meetings were open to all Laney students in Spring, 1984. Two hundred and thirty-four (234) students actually attended these meetings.

Noting that a dynamic program was planned for Fall, 1984, this report concluded by suggesting that a "ripple affect" was created, whereby, "other community colleges and neighboring feeder high schools are expressing an interest and concern regarding the transfer phenomenon."

It would seem that these efforts could be easily maintained and institutionalized. Although the number of students involved was small, and plans for continuation were not specifically indicated, this project seems to have fully fulfilled its objectives. It deserves an A.

Rating = C

## #12 LAWSON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Lawson State College's Spring 1984 report to the Ford Foundation includes 12 activities that were undertaken for the Transfer Opportunities Program. Two of these were to be completed by September 1, 1984. Five activities were completed at an 100% level; one had a 75% completion rate; and four, 50% completion.

The activities listed as being completed at the 100% level were to:

1. Develop two workshops for related faculty in the six feeder high schools,
2. Develop a special course delivery system for students not receiving complete satisfaction from articulation
3. Provide group/individual advising to all potential transfer students before May 30, 1984,
4. Discuss present articulation strengths and weaknesses with members of four senior universities, and
5. Provide transfer and potential transfer students with individual counseling and advising by senior university admissions representatives.

Completed at the 75% level was an activity to develop four articulation agreements in five areas of study: science, business education, electronics, social worker technician, and electronic data processing technology.

Completed at the 50% level were activities to:

1. Develop a process model for future articulation,
2. Disseminate results of articulation agreements and feeder high school workshops to college and high school personnel,
3. Track Lawson State transfer students to provide feedback for course revision (9 students listed), and
4. Develop peer partnership programs between faculty.

Not to be completed until Fall, 1984 (and reports of these have not been made available to the Center) were projects to:

1. Utilize a model to strengthen course content and
2. Disseminate the results of the articulation agreement to Lawson State students through orientation.

The Lawson State final report consists of over 300 pages -- letters, agreement plans, scribbled notes, and lists of participants. While this might sound impressive, it is actually both ambiguous and ridiculous. The papers themselves suggest two things: that extensive numbers and numerous sheets of paper substitute for thought and activity, and that an attempt was made to impress the Foundation by sheer weight of paper! Little more need be said about this report. On every level, it deserves the lowest possible rating - C.

Rating = A

## #13 LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE

Los Angeles City College's UCCTOP project centered around an instructional delivery system that integrates academic courses, skills courses, and counseling services. Co-teaming instructors from academic disciplines with instructors representing skills disciplines, this approach tied skills training into academic courses. The objective was to facilitate student learning of skills in order to master specific academic content. Counselors in student assessment, guidance, and evaluation were also involved with course instructors. The counselors providing feedback to instructors and the instructors providing information to counselors.

Four major types of activities were achieved during the course of this project:

1. Development and implementation of paired courses. Course curriculum and instructional materials were developed for three paired courses during the Fall 1983 semester and piloted in the spring term. These courses were Principles of Business Data Processing 1 paired with English 1 (College Reading and Composition; History 1 (Introduction to Western Civilization 1) paired with English 28 (Modern Thought and Expression); and Physics 11 (Introductory Physics) paired with Math 3 (Trigonometry). Peer tutors and team counselors as well as designated course instructors were involved in all three courses.

2. Instructional Strategies. Strategies considered particularly significant focused on class scheduling, integrated instructor efforts, involvement of the content in skills acquisition assignments, and integration of content material into skills exercises and assignments.

Courses were offered during consecutive time blocks and in the same room, which increased student identification with the paired course concept. It also allowed instructors to work with students on specific assignments (i.e., a writing assignment) for a block of two consecutive hours when appropriate.

Paired instructors worked together closely. The content/skills faculty pair held joint office hours so they could meet together with students on joint assignments, and the teaching schedules of the skills instructor were arranged to allow observation of lectures by the content instructor. This facilitated the content instructor's understanding of the particular skills level required for content mastery.

3. Counseling Effectiveness. LACC's report states that integrating counseling into the paired courses "has had a positive effect upon student transfer." This may very well be the case, but no data are reported, only notes regarding the rapport between counselors and students, students' awareness of transfer requirements, and similar other items.

Other transfer related activities included the use of Project ACCESS (Action for Community College Enhancement of Student Success). Orientation and assessment were scheduled to be institutionalized in 1984-1985, the testing instrument having been piloted in the three UCCTOP paired classes. Teacher exchanges between the LACC and UCLA English departments became a vehicle for enhancing understanding of competencies needed by students who plan to transfer to a baccalaureate granting institution.

Another cooperative relationship grew out of the enthusiasm of four year institutions over the concept of the integrated instructional delivery system. A series of intrasegmental meetings began with English, math, and basic skills Faculty Forums at California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) and California State University, Northridge, (CSUN). The purpose of these faculty meetings was to explore a closer parallel between classes at the freshman and sophomore levels and to foster a smoother transition into junior level classes. In addition, further discussions are under way with UCLA that may result in guaranteed transfer for those students who have participated in the paired course program. And, finally, Los Angeles City College worked on a proposal to offer a joint class with California State University, Los Angeles so that student transfer can be articulated early.

In the absence of data regarding numbers of students and faculty involved, it is difficult to assess the value of this program. However, it presents an interesting merger of curriculum with direct student contact. Plans for continuation were enunciated in the report--for example, in Fall, 1984, the math-science-engineering departments was expected to introduce a series of eight cores of coordinated courses for students, who would enter at any level of mastery and who want to pursue a math-technology major.

New paired courses were to be offered in Fall 1984 in Philosophy/ Reading and History 2/English 1. In Spring 1985, a new course in World Literature and Art History, which would emphasize relevant composition assignments, was to be instituted.

This report from LACC closes with the statement that as a result of the Ford UCCTOP grant, "an awareness has been created on the part of a majority of the faculty and staff as to the need for early assistance with planning and preparation for transfer. Many of our instructors have been looking for just such a concept to restructure their courses, thus providing their students with more meaningful course material. And, it is our belief that the ultimate success of any transfer program is predicated upon classroom attention being accorded to acquisition of specific skills and content needed for transfer. Academic training designed specifically for transfer preparation is necessary for increasing the transfer opportunity of urban minorities."

Despite the lack of specific data to confirm the text, this project deserves an A.

Rating = B

## #14 LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE

Four objectives were established by Los Angeles Harbor College for its UCCTOP project. These were to increase the number of students transferring to four-year colleges and universities, increase the number of minority students transferring to those institutions, improve articulation and outreach efforts between the college and proximate nearby universities, and incorporate activities with those of Project ASSET involving student transfer.

In Fall 1983 Harbor College selected 1900 students to constitute its Transfer Pool. These students had been identified by the Project ASSET student data base on four criteria: having attended student orientation and assessment, having indicated transfer as a goal on Project ASSETS' Educational Planning Summary Form, having achieved a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.3, and having completed 35 units or more. Students in this Transfer Pool were notified by letter about academic advising sessions. Minority students were also telephoned as a follow-up measure. At these sessions counselors discussed the transition from two to four-year institutions; over 350 students from the Transfer Pool participated in these sessions.

All 1900 students in the Transfer Pool were invited to participate in a Pilot Mail Registration Project, with 549 students so doing. This pilot project laid the foundation for mail registration for 5000 continuing students.

A Directory of Transfer Students, with 169 students planning to transfer to one of the three designated universities, assured contact by the receiving institutions. In addition, outreach counselors from three universities worked a cumulative sum of 20 hours in Harbors' Transfer Center, assisting students in transfer preparation. Twenty-five (25) students also participated in tours of four baccalaureate degree-awarding campuses. Identification of minority students who transferred to one university was made by the Student Affirmative Action Coordinator, and special fellowships were offered to minority students who would pursue careers in sociology, biology, and psychology at another four-year institution. Nine students were offered other scholarships.

This range of activities included articulation conferences, a computerized transfer information project with one university, and the preparation and mailing of a student evaluation survey.

This report is among the most direct and succinct of the 24 reports of UCCTOP projects. The activities all seemed useful, and they certainly could be extended. At the same time, they seemed a bit diffuse--too many activities for too few students. This project could well take some tightening up efforts. It is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = B

## #15 LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE

This project was administered by a part-time Project Director who was a full-time professor of history selected by a committee. Although because of the effort in finding a director, the project started late, it met its objectives. And whereas the proposal had called for identification of 50 students intending to transfer, more than 90 students inquired about the program, 86 applications were filed, 42 applicants became program participants; and 25 students deferred their applications until 1985-1986. The entire project was clearly built on a direct hands-on recruitment of students.

In addition, 12 alumni-tutors were hired by the College, with some problems pertaining to time commitments at their universities and holiday breaks. Tutors were finally assigned student case loads and were trained in tutorial methodology by the coordinator of the College's Tutorial Center. Twelve volunteer faculty mentors were also involved with 55 program participants.

The College reported that of its 102 students planning to graduate, 56 would transfer. Forty-two (42) of these were active Mission UCCTOP participants, and twelve of these students were to graduate with honors in June, 1984.

This report is full of excuses about time, number of students, and program changes, despite the facts that the hands-on approach is admirable, and the methodology employed here is interesting. The report indicates fairly specific continuation plans, and these should be easily implemented. In spite of so many excuses and "if comes", the report seems sincere and fairly well thought out. It deserves a rating of B.

Rating = A

## #16 MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The goals of this project at Miami-Dade's North Campus were to identify problems that students encounter when transferring to baccalureate-granting institutions, and to provide an infrastructure and support system to facilitate transition. A two-fold approach was developed to meet these objectives: the establishment of a mechanism that would provide continuous feedback from students who had already transferred, and the design of a program to prepare students prior to transfer. Project activities revolved about nine objectives, which were to :

1. Identify competencies necessary for a successful transfer experience. Through the DACUM process -- (Designing A Curriculum) -- a chart was prepared that identified both effective and cognitive competencies necessary for a successful transfer student. This chart contains nine major areas of concern for the potential transfer student.
2. Develop a feedback mechanism that allows for continuous reassessment of a transferring student preparation program. A training program was established for five faculty members to become DACUM facilitators. These five formed a core to train other MDCC-NC personnel.
3. Identify problems encountered by students pursuing upper division studies. Former Miami-Dade students were surveyed by means of both questionnaires and individual interviews.

Responses were tallied from 419 students at the time this report was prepared; other questionnaires were still expected, so the number of completed surveys was probably higher.

4. Remediate transfer problems by formulating strategies for better student preparation.

5. Reinforce and expand current activities and programs identified as beneficial.

6. Create specific instructional models that provide relevant information and develop skills needed by transferring students. To fulfill these three objectives, faculty members from mathematics, English, study skills, and student services developed and/or revised 11 modules to meet competency areas identified on the DACUM chart. In addition to these credit modules, non-credit workshops were also developed to prepare students to transfer.

7. Incorporate these modules within the Challenge Center curriculum. The Challenge Center is a model program designed to increase retention and achievement of underachieving minority students. Workshops conducted at this Center utilized new curricula materials for students and trained Challenge Center personnel to conduct future workshops on the modules.

8. Design a system to ensure continuity of service from students' pre-entry to MDCC-NC through upper division studies. An on-going interactive orientation model was developed to track students.

9. Build and strengthen the university liaison system.

University personnel were involved in the DACUM process for active participation in student transfer.

A number of mechanisms facilitate transfer in Florida from the two-year to four-year college: a common calendar, common course numbering system, articulation agreements, CLAST (College Level Academic Skills Test), a common university/community college entry test, and the university/community college liaison program. Miami-Dade students benefit from three more systems endemic to this institution -- AGIS-Advisement and Graduation Information System, SOAP-Standards of Academic Progress, and Academic Alert, a computer system informing students of their mid-term progress. Through these systems and the participation of university personnel in DACUM chart updating, the MDCC/university system is strengthened.

Several activities were outlined in this report to ensure continuation of efforts. The project deserves an A in every way.

Rating = B

# #17 COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA

The project developed by the Community College of Philadelphia was based on the premise that the failure of the colleges' transfer function was due in part to limited contact between many students and faculty. Accordingly, steps taken to address this problem concentrated in large part on the college's faculty.

Instructors from sociology, psychology, anthropology, and composition, who had been identified by the project director and appropriate division chairpersons, constructed and taught an interdisciplinary course, "Introduction to Social Science." The goal of this course was to replace the typical introductory courses with a 12 hour integrated curriculum unit. Both curriculum and staff development activities occurred--with frequent meetings, rethinking of pedagogical goals and procedures, and creating new ways of relating to students. Extensive discussions were held regarding the goals of the writing program, alternative models of writing-across-the-curriculum, and group examination of selected student papers.

A mentoring component was also planned and implemented with faculty members and counselors. And faculty were prepared to assume seminar responsibilities in addition to lecturing.

Before this program began in Spring 1984, several administrative tasks were undertaken: the pool of potential transfer students was identified, admissions and registration procedures were established, and arrangements were made with the colleges' largest remedial program to register students interested in transfer. A longitudinal study was then conducted of students in this program who were block scheduled.

When the program began in January, two sections of the new interdisciplinary 12 unit program were taught. In Spring, a second faculty group was assembled to develop a 12 credit Introduction to the Humanities. Plans were made to continue both these programs.

The report suggests that both faculty development and curriculum development actually will continue for several years. Plans were made to enroll part-time as well as full-time students in the future, and attempts were made to involve counseling staff, who previously had tended to ignore the importance of the transfer program. Other plans included improving articulation agreements and the formation of an advisory group of four-year college administrators. Plans to institutionalize the program included the possible modification of associate degrees.

This project differs considerably from the other 23. It seems to have a definite curricular focus, but it deals with transfer issues rather indirectly -- in terms of faculty and curriculum development rather than immediately with students. It is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = A

## #18 J. SARGEANT REYNOLDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This project concentrated on encouraging high school students to enter J. Sargeant Reynolds' transfer program, and building a support network of J. Sargeant Reynolds alumni to assist current students who comtemplate transfer to a four-year institution. Four target groups were involved: public high school students who were not enrolled in college preparatory curriculum, currently enrolled JSRCC business administration transfer students, business administration alumni who had completed the baccalaureate degree, and JSRCC -- alumni currently enrolled at a local university.

In December 1984, the college established a position of Alumni Transfer Coordinator; because of this late start, a request was made to the Ford Foundation for a no-cost extension of the project. Although the report evaluated by the Center was seen by JSRCC as an interim rather than a final report, most of the proposed activities were completed.

Outreach to students in feeder high schools accounted for much of the work. Students in 10th grade typing classes at proximate high schools were the target group since these individuals do not typically choose a college preparatory curriculum. Thirty-five (35) Richmond high school business teachers and 41 counselors participated in an in-service training workshop with the JSRCC project director, discussing transfer opportunities and UCCTOP plans. Twenty three JSRCC alumni attended a meeting to discuss the high school program, and, beginning in February, a series of alumni volunteers made presentations at the seven Richmond high schools, speaking with 47 classes (498 students) regarding the baccalaureate degree. These students completed a brief questionnaire in which 45% indicated an interest in learning more about transfer opportunities.

Publicity about this program generated interest in the community as well as in the college. Although subsequent meetings were poorly attended, a follow-up survey of high school students netted a response rate of 71% (335 returns). Ninety five percent (95%) of these respondents found the presentations useful, 68% indicated plans to enter college after completing high school, and 50% planned to enter a community college transfer program.

This report notes that "the most exciting result of the survey to us is the fact that 56 students (16% of those returning the survey) indicated that they have or will change schedules to include additional college preparatory courses in their high school program as a result of the presentations made through this project." Along these same lines, a survey of high school business teachers was to be completed by June (not included in this report).

The second major effort of this project was the development of an alumni support network for community college students who contemplated transfer. These Alumni Transfer Coordinators worked with university staff members to identify JSRCC alumni presently enrolled at the university as well as JSRCC current students applying to enter a baccalaureate institution. Nineteen alumni were identified, and plans were made for their continued work with JSRCC students.

Because of the delay in starting this project and the no-cost extension requested, it is difficult to assess the project as completed. At the same time, the objectives outlined in the UCCTOP proposal were met successfully, and plans were made to institutionalize the program with the help of locally controlled non-state funds as well as the alumni organization. Richmond City school financial aid specialists have asked to accompany JSRCC personnel on future high school visits. This project deserves a rating of A.

Rating = B

## #19 ROXBURY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Augmented by a three year grant from the Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust, Roxbury Community Colleges' UCCTOP project included a number of activities that met varying degrees of success. Some of these were conducted simultaneously under the Cox Award to improve articulation between RCC and four neighboring colleges.

Six faculty members, representing each of the college's academic divisions, met weekly for one semester with two staff members from the Program for Academic Support. Each member of this Faculty Work Group chose a specific activity to work on independently and to discuss at the weekly meetings: 1) Developmental Mathematics (redesigning course modules); 2) Mastery Learning of ESL; 3) General Science Concepts (a four of section course developed to familiarize students with laboratory equipment and procedures); 4) Developmental Skills Program (a 9 credit program for 100 students testing at the lowest range of English, math, and ESL placement tests); 5) Textbook Readability Project; 6) Summer Enrichment Program (developing an intensive nine credit pilot project that includes a three course enrichment program for 30 new students); 7) Course Equivalency with the University of Massachusetts-Boston (faculty review of a U. Mass. guide that assigns major, elective, or no credit to Roxbury courses); 8) Transferring Career Programs; 9) La Guardia Community College (visit to La Guardia's skills program), and 10) Improving Faculty Advising.

A basic study on patterns of student transfer sought answers to such questions as: What type of RCC students seeks to transfer? Are these students usually admitted? How many of their credits are accepted for transfer? Are students given a solid educational foundation, or are they experiencing more difficulty in succeeding in certain areas? Which transfer institution are most popular? How many students who transfer actually receive a baccalaureate degree?

In order to answer these questions, students from the 1981 and 1982 RCC graduating classes were followed. The number of actual students queried and the survey results were not included in the report that is available at the Center.

Other RCC activities included four Transfer Workshops and a Transfer Day, the hiring of a full-time transfer counselor, discussions on articulation agreements, summer consultation involving RCC faculty members and faculty from the linking institutions, formulation of a transfer opportunities advisory committee, and the development of a Minority Retention Consortium.

Each of the six original objectives met with some degree of success, with curriculum development becoming the primary focus. Other objectives were to decrease student attrition, increase coordination and planning, expand faculty advising responsibility, increase student services, and develop articulation agreements. All these efforts seem to have been sincere, but they represent too many activities for a single college to accomplish in a short time span. The project appears too diffused, and its ability to sustain itself is argueable, even with the Cox Trust support. This project is evaluated as B.

Rating = B

# #20 SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

This project attempted to design and implement joint activities with feeder high schools and receiver colleges, establish a program to strengthen academic skills of transfer minority students, improve telecommunications links between two proximate four-year institutions, expand the Senior High School Program, and continue formalized articulation with the unified school district. Five activities tied to the specific objectives provided the bulk of the work.

An advisory committee composed of key staff members from Sacramento City College, local high schools, and receiver institutions was formed to determine screening procedures that would identify potential transfers. Students were required to possess at least three of six criteria: ethnicity, completion of 30 or more units by June 1983, a G.P.A. of 2.0 or higher, completion of English composition with a grade of A or B, financial or Education Opportunity Program eligibility, and recommendation by a faculty member. Of the approximately 1500 student transcripts reviewed, 465 students met at least three of these characteristics. One hundred sixty-one (161) of these students were recruited for 1983-84 UCCTOP participation; 286 who transfer after the 1984-85 academic year, were identified for UCCTOP II.

Each student's academic ability was assessed through diagnostic tests of skills, interests, and values. Individual plans were then developed with the students to define, implement, and refine educational goals.

In order to facilitate the transfer process, students were enrolled in an Human Development "College Success" course, team taught by a counselor and a social service instructor. Each class section, limited to 20 students, dealt with issues regarding self-esteem, academic fears, study skills, and career exploration. Guest lecturers from receiver universities were also involved, and students were taken on field trips to receiver institutions.

The final objective was to evaluate the transfer success of identified students. A student evaluation form showed a high degree of satisfaction with the program, but such a statement, of course, needs more specific clarification.

In addition, efforts were made to help eighth grade students think about their goals, one of the several activities conducted by Sacramento that was built upon efforts made prior to Ford support. Plans to continue the project were not mentioned. This project is assigned a rating of B.

Rating = A

## #21 SAN DIEGO CITY COLLEGE

In order to identify candidates for transfer to a four-year institution, San Diego City College developed a computer program that would create a file of potential transfer students for the district student data base. This file identified eight variables as criteria: an indicated interest in transferring, 2.0 G.P.A., full-time enrollment, number of units completed, age, gender, ethnicity, and address. Over 1500 students who were selected by these criteria were invited to participate in the project. Since 125 had been targeted as the project sample, those chosen were to be students from the pool who self-selected themselves.

In addition to the development of a computer program to create a file of potential students from the existing data bases -- a worthwhile effort in itself--, the following activities occurred during the course of this project:

1. An invitational introductory meeting was held to kick off the project and inform students and faculty of pending activities. At this meeting, leading academics (selected as role models) discussed experiences at their universities, small groups of students met with admissions staff, and data were obtained from attendees regarding their majors and proposed transfer institutions.
2. Both formal and informal meetings were held with faculty senate and selected department chairs.

3. Two hundred forty six (246) students attended an Applications Workshop for both the State College and University of California systems.
4. Financial Aid Workshops involved 358 students, many of whom were unfamiliar with the mechanics of applying for assistance.
5. The For-Trans counselor developed materials to strengthen the efforts of other counselors with individual students.
6. Local private four-year institutions were invited to spend a morning at San Diego City College. However, just six SDCC students attended the meeting.
7. Five seminars on specific majors (engineering, business, telecommunications, computer science, and pre-professional) were attended by 145 out of 305 invited students. Both City College and four-year college faculty representatives worked with the selected students.

In addition to these activities, the campus articulation committee was reorganized. Plans were made to recruit 125 students with the most active project history for interviews with the project team and with faculty members. Transfer packets were to be given to each student and interviews held regarding Guidance Information System data.

Although all data have not been included in this report, objectives were met in terms of students, faculty, and support services. Plans for institutionalization seem feasible. This project deserves a rating of A for its compilation of basic data on students alone.

Rating = A

## #22 SOUTH MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Emphasizing the guidance of students from initial college enrollment to transfer and retention at a four-year institution, this project consisted of three major components: college orientation, a mentor program, and university orientation program. Each portion had several specific objectives, most of which were met through specific activities.

For the College Orientation Program, a course was created to serve 40 students. Faculty were recruited; educational assessment and attitudinal instruments chosen; student selection criteria developed; college facilities scheduled; special counseling, financial aid, and early registration arranged for students; and the program was offered. Less than 40 students were actually involved; exact numbers not reported.

Matching third or fourth semester students with faculty members in order to explore career and academic options was the major thrust of the Mentor Programs. One-on-one orientation/training sessions were arranged for selected faculty and mentors, and students attended many specially scheduled events. A list of university peers, noted in the original proposal, was found to be unnecessary since most South Mountain faculty members involved in the project already had contact at Arizona State, the major receiving institution.

Thirty two (32) students were recruited for the University Orientation Program, 18 actually enrolled, and 17 completed the program. This included ASU campus tours for selected students as well as SMCC student participation in the university orientation courses. Plans were made to double the size of the program for Fall 1984.

The Mentor Program was revised to institute levels, having advanced students serve as mentors to new SMCC and/or to high school students. Plans were also made for several work-study students to aid in establishing a reliable student network. In addition, this report includes a brief self-evaluation.

This program holds well for the future. It is concise, the model works well, and it deserves a rating of A.

Rating = C

# #23 STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

In the letter to Alison Bernstein of the Ford Foundation accompanying State Community College's narrative report, mention was made of an album of photographs. These were not indicated in the report to the Center, and may or may not be meaningful. What does appeal useful is the statement, in the same letter, that "...the success of the Project's activities have brought into focus the need for the transfer function to become a priority within the institution. Consequently, this Project has the endorsement and support of the administration and the Board of Trustees for its continuation after grant funds expire."

This report of objectives and related activities seems to enforce that statement. The college:

1. Established a concurrent program with Southern Illinois University for 13 students completing their Associate Degrees. These students were designated as Ford Fellows and received direct stipends of $350 for transportation, tuition and fees, textbooks, and supplies.
2. A feeder program was implemented to provide internship/procticum experiences with students at several sites.
3. The "Society of Ford Fellows" was established with 13 current students and two former Ford Foundation recipients.
4. A resource library was established in the Office of Counseling Services, housed in an area with PLATO.

5. A transfer handbook was in the process of completion at the time the report was submitted. This handbook, a guide to admission into Southern Illinois University, was to be distributed to students in business, computer science and mathematics, and science programs.
6. An advisement articulation manual for staff use in advising students was also in the process of completion, for distribution in June 1984. No evidence of this manual was included in the report.

In addition to these efforts, programs in business, computer science and mathematics, and science, which had not been revised since the mid-1970's, were updated and became the basis for articulation agreements. An Advisory Committee was formed to assist the UCCTOP, and a pre-engineering summer enrichment program was developed.

The intentions of this program were met. However, very few students were involved, and the program truly seems to ignore the humanities and other essential liberal arts fields, certainly important areas for transfer students. Although State Community College met its objectives and made a written commitment to continue activities, the report stimulates skepticism. It is assigned a rating of C.

Rating = C

# #24 WEST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

Excuses appear endemic to Los Angeles Colleges! Here again, apologies regarding late starts, financial crises, and mistakes introduce the final report. Yet, the project appears to have achieved some of its objectives, which were to: expand identification of students from feeder high schools who would become potential transfer; reduce scholastic shock through the use of West Los Angeles Community College mentor/counselors to high school students and UCLA students to West L.A. students; introduce videotaped materials in small group discussions; and develop a multi-discipline general educational course.

Not all of these objectives were met. One instead of two receiving institutions was identified. The testing procedure was moved from pre- to post-, after students had been admitted. Eight instead of 32 students were identified as potential UCLA transfers. Of 12 mentors finally selected, several were disqualified, and four UCLA students were consequently hired as mentors identified to West Los Angeles students. These students participated in an open forum, responded to questions, and lead tours of the UCLA campus.

Other proposed activities included a two week training session for mentor/counselors, which was shortened to two evening sessions. Further changes were made in these individuals' responsibilities to the identified community college students. Live visits to classes replaced videotaping of university and college lectures, but selected West Los Angeles students (how many?) did spend a day at

UCLA.

Other activities appear equally haphazard and/or altered, with few people involved and many excuses. Although the idea of a mentor program appears worthwhile, the report itself states that it "will require a much tighter supervisory and administrative control." The Center concurs. The plan was apparently not very clearly thought out, and was even less definitely executed. This report is assigned a rating of C.

# CHAPTER EIGHT:
# RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

The data presented and analyzed throughout this report suggest several ways of strengthening transfer opportunities in the UCCTOP colleges. The recommendations put forth in this section are organized into three general areas of transfer education: policy, organization, and content.

## Transfer Education Policy

Institutional policies are important not only as guidelines for action but also as symbolic gestures of conveying to institutional constituencies the importance attached to stated goals. While all community colleges describe transfer education as one of their several functions in their mission statements, other ways could be found of supplementing short mission statements so as to increase the visibility of transfer education. Leaders convey messages to their constituencies about institutional priorities and concerns by what they pay attention to in a variety of ways: in the content of their formal addresses to faculty and other members of the institution, in items comprising the agenda of board meetings, in the type of information they show an interest in, in the kinds of activities they invest their time. Because policy-making is driven by what institutional leaders focus their attention on, the formulation of policies to strengthen transfer education may be more probable if institutional leaders would increase their level of activity in areas related to transfer education. In this regard, the recommendations we make to institutional leaders are:

(1) To regard formal and informal meetings with institutional constituencies (students, faculty, administrators and staff, and board members) as opportunities to voice concern for and support of transfer education. The more frequently and the greater the variety of contexts in which the topic is brought up the greater the likelihood of transfer education becoming a topic of interest and discussion among others in the institution.

(2) To increase the prestige attached to transfer education and hence its legitimacy as an important institutional function by delegating the responsibility for the administration of transfer education and special services to a high level office in the administrative hierarchy. Or by creating a special office and title such as Vice President or Dean of Transfer Education and Related Services.

(3) To request frequently and from a variety of institutional sources information about institutional activities related to transfer education. To commission special studies to evaluate institutional effectiveness in its performance of the transfer function.

(4) To form special committees or task forces made up of faculty, staff, and students to study and make recommendations for strengthening the transfer function.

(5) To invite presidents of senior colleges and universities to their campuses for the purpose of communicating the importance of transfer education to the college and discussing options for strengthening interinstitutional cooperation to facilitate the transfer process.

Purposefully, we have refrained from suggesting specific actions related to resource allocation and educational policy because each institution functions in a different environment and have varying levels of autonomy from policies formulated on a statewide level or a system level (e.g., community colleges that are part of a district or university system). The five recommendations focus on symbolic actions that can be valuable as a means of ascribing a more prominent role to transfer education. Additionally, depite the symbolic nature inherent in the recommendations made, they could be an effective way of shaping policy supportive of transfer education as a result of changed institutional perceptions.

Our studies of the transfer function nationwide have yielded other findings and recommendations. Articulation of curriculum and transfer information varies considerably from institution to institution and from district to district. Some community colleges have clearcut articulation agreements with senior institutions and articulation committees comprised of staff members from both levels who meet regularly to work out curriculum and transfer information agreements. But in others there is total silence and lack of agreement of what is transferable and what is not. Furthermore, the articulation of curriculum between community colleges and high schools in their region is typically much worse than between the colleges and the universities; we found few regularly functioning committees working on curriculum articulation and transfer between high school and community college.

In some states common course numbering systems have been adopted as a way of enhancing the process of students transferring from one institution to another. Naturally, a common course numbering system helps, but as long as the staff in any academic department at a senior institution has the right of acceptance or refusal of courses from graduation credit in that department, common course numbering is by no means enough. As an example, students who transfer from Richland College in the Dallas Community College District to the University of Texas at Arlington may have their courses accepted at full value whereas transfers from Mountain View

College in the same district may not.

At the least, reliable data sets can be established but the community colleges themselves cannot do so; they are not equipped to collect such information. A few years ago the California Statewide Longitudinal Study offered an example of the way such data could be aggregated but that took an extramurally funded effort. All three sectors of higher education must cooperate in organizing a system to collect transfer information. CSU has begun such a data collection system that could be encouraged. It provides the community colleges with at least an estimate of their students transferring to one or another CSU branch. It does not include UC or the private universities and it has other weaknesses -- for example, a student may have attended a community college for a year, taken one course at another college, put that latter college down as the "college last attended" and thus confounded the data set. Because of California's liberal admissions and transfer policies, it is difficult to organize a system that provides reliable data on a statewide basis. In order to organize such a system decisions will have to be made about the relative importance of reliable, comparable statewide data and data gathered and presented in a fashion that best suits individual sending and receiving institutions.

Some states are further advanced in their data collection efforts. Washington and Maryland aggregate data across their higher education system. The Florida university system and the Florida State Department of Commerce prepare a tape each year which contains the social security numbers of students who have entered the university or who have obtained employment. The tape is made available to community colleges so that they can run it against their own records and at least get an estimate of the number of their students who have transferred or who have gone to work. The tape is incomplete because it does not include students who have transferred to private universities within state or to any universities out of state but it offers a step in the right direction.

## Transfer Education Organization

One serious weakness in transfer education appears to be lack of integration among the components comprising transfer education: the curriculum, support services, and information systems. While it is understandable that the transfer curriculum is the primary responsibility of the faculty; information services the primary responsibility of counselors and other student service personnel; and information gathering and reporting the primary responsibility of institutional researchers; nevertheless, each of these aspects are interdependent. For instance, the student information gathered and analyzed by institutional researchers loses its potential usefulness if the links that exist between offices of information services are so weak that the data they generate rarely get incorporated into academic or counseling services.

Integration of transfer education, besides increasing the coordination of differentiated services, would have the added benefit of making transfer education a more specialized educational service. Strategically this could prove to be an effective way of counteracting institutional characteristics that may negatively affect student predisposition to transfer such as internal diversity and the lack of coherence resulting thereof, or the lesser likelihood of developing student awareness of institutional services due to their dispersion throughout various offices. While the problems associated with internal diversity are common to all large and comprehensive institutions of higher education and not to community colleges alone, they may have more serious consequences for community colleges because of differences in educational goals among students who enroll in them. In contrast, in a large university despite internal diversity due to their tripartite mission: teaching, service, and research, all undergraduates have a common goal -- fulfilling the requirements for the baccalaureate degree.

To bring about greater integration and coordination of transfer education as well as greater differentiation from other institutional functions, the following recommendations are suggested:

(1) Defining the range of services related to transfer education and identifying areas where joint efforts should be established between two or more separate offices.

(2) If no office exists (as suggested in recommendation #2 under Policy) to oversee transfer education and related services, a transfer education policy council representative of different institutional segments could act as a coordinating agent.

(3) A system of identifying potential transfer students at the point of entry should be available in all colleges. These students should be singled out for special services, especially during their first year. Special services, however, should not be interpreted as having a procedural or standardized orientation, e.g., assigning all students to an introductory class on college survival skills. Instead special services should focus on strategies of developing individual skills and knowledge that can lead to increased commitment to initial educational aspirations. For instance, a core group of faculty could be trained to serve as mentors (a strategy that has been successfully implemented by South Mountain College); forming small groups of students for on-going activities, e.g., group coun-

seling sessions, study groups, workshops on special topics.

(4) Assigning students to a specific counselor who has been trained to work with potential transfer students. Many community colleges have given up the practice of assigning counselors to students; instead, students see any counselor that is available. Counselors should have complete profiles for each of the students assigned to them.

(5) College orientation sessions should be held for the purpose of introducing students to the college and its key offices. Orientation sessions should include walking tours of the campus led by advanced students, special cultural activities, and greetings from college officials. While we recognize that orientation sessions in the traditional collegiate sense are difficult to organize in community colleges due to revolving admissions and the part-time status of many students, there is still reason to believe that many students could benefit from extensive orientation sessions. And while orientation sessions of this kind might be less expedient and more costly than the videotaped orientation format adopted by some colleges, the potential long-range benefits may justify the investment.

The five recommendations related to organization stress the need to define the potential transfer student population and to integrate services so as to make transfer education more holistic. There are two recommendations not included here that were addressed in the body of the report. The first, the creation of an organizational structure to simulate a "transfer-college-within-a college," has not been explicitly addressed because not all colleges have the resources to bring about the kind of major reorganization such a recommendation might require. However, our recommendations implicitly address the concept of "transfer-college-within-a college." Additionally, institutional size may preclude some institutions from undertaking such an effort; however, small institutions might be able to experiment with the idea by starting-out with a small group of students.

The second recommendation not explicitly addressed here is that of defining the fundamental properties of an environment conducive to transfer education; however, implicit within the content of the recommendations made so far and the ones listed below is that such properties will become self-evident for institutions that become actively engaged in debating the merits and appropriateness of the suggestions made.

For students to stay for two years at a community college and then transfer, a full array of second year, sophomore-level courses must be offered. However, in most community colleges those courses are severly attenuated because of the shortfall in enrollment at that level. As long as students may transfer without obtaining an Associate in Arts or Sciences degree, as long as they may transfer after having only taken introductory courses at the community college, the two-year institutions will have difficulty in attracting enough second-level students to fill the courses. Accordingly, they offer fewer sophomore-level courses and fewer students stay for the second year. A downward spiral takes effect. This shows up in examining curriculum data. In the Los Angeles Community College District, enrollment in courses for which there is a prerequisite in the same discipline accounts for 14% of the humanities enrollments, 14% of the social sciences, 17% of the sciences, 11% of the mathematics, and 7% of the English. Nearly all the enrollments in those areas is in introductory and remedial classes.

We have learned also that any review of faculty characteristics or of instructional expenditures in community colleges sheds little light on issues pertaining to transfer. Faculty tenure policies, the ratio of full-time to part-time instructors, and whether or not collective bargaining agreements are in effect show no relationship to patterns of student transfer. Similarly faculty salaries, the prime component in the cost of instruction, are not related. There is a relationship between class size and transfer rates but that seems to be because second-level courses are almost always smaller than introductory classes.

The most effective activities enhancing transfer seem to be those in which a single institution works out transfer agreements with the senior college in its immediate area. Instead of statewide articulation agreements, which almost always fall short of enhancing transfer, transfer has been made more feasible in areas where pairs of institutions work out arrangements at the department or program level. An example of these types of agreements is afforded by reviewing the process operating in Phoenix between Arizona State University and the Maricopa Community College District. There, committees comprised of members of both institutions meet program by program to design curriculum and student information systems that enhance the flow from one institution to another. Their success is suggested by the fact that 40% of Arizona State University's junior class is comprised of transfers from the Maricopa District. The university limits the number of freshmen it will take and because the alternative for students living in Phoenix and environs is to go to one of the seven colleges in the Maricopa District, those colleges enroll a high proportion of freshmen and sophomores who will transfer. Furthermore, the university anticipates receiving those transfers and makes special provisions for them. Curriculum in some of the paired programs is so designed that the university does not even offer the freshman courses in those programs but insists that the student transfer in having already had such introdcutory courses. In sum, articulation agreements work best when they are arranged at the program level between pairs of institutions in the same neighborhood. This suggests that transfer would be enhanced in California to the extent that Pierce College works with CSU Northridge, Chabot College with CSU Hayward, and so on. Santa Barbara City College and the University of California at Santa Barbara are well along with such agreements and jointly conceived programs.

Other efforts to enhance transfer can be made. Structural changes in community colleges that attempt to enhance student flow are particularly effective. Miami-Dade Community College has received much publicity for its rate of student retention and transfer. Since 1975 the college has had a distinct commitment to enhance its transfer numbers and to hold students for the full two years or more, as long as it takes, to prepare them for transfer. This past year Miami-Dade awarded Associate Degrees to over one-fifth of its student population, a ratio considerably higher than that seen in any other large public institution. This college was able to boast also that it provided one-sixth of all the transfers in the state of Florida, a number made all the more notable by viewing the geography of the state; Florida's major state universities are between 250 and 500 miles from Miami. A comparable figure for California would be revealed if the Los Angeles Community College District provided one-sixth of the transfers entering the

University of California campuses at Berkeley, Davis, and Santa Cruz, and the California State University campuses at Hayward, San Luis Obispo, and Fresno.

How did Miami-Dade do it? Curriculum reformation is part of the story. The college built an honors program to attract the better students from the Miami high schools and offered full tuition scholarships to students from the top 10% of their graduating class. Miami-Dade enrolls nearly 40% of that top student group. But the college also built a support system that has had even greater effect. By designing a full complement of remedial courses and testing students at entry, it was able to place students in courses where they had a chance for success. The colleges imposed a limitation on drop-in students who, after having enrolled in four courses, are precluded from enrolling in the fifth until they have taken a placement test in English and mathematics and entered a program leading to a degree or certificate. It invoked standards of academic progress and enforced probation and suspension on students who were not making satisfactory progress toward completing a degree. It designed a computer-generated response system with variable prescription that informs students each semester of their progress toward completing the program in which they are enrolled. It built an academic graduation information system that shows students exactly which courses are required for transfer to each branch of the state university and each department within that branch. This latter system is readily accessible so that a student may walk into a counseling office, have his or her record placed on a screen, and see exactly which courses are needed to complete the transfer requirements in any program.

## Content of Transfer Education

As pointed out in other sections of this report, transfer education embodies procedural and qualitative aspects. There is reason to believe that the procedural aspect has been more a focus of attention than the qualitative aspect. Both aspects merit closer examination.

The procedural aspect of transfer education refers to the delivery of services related to assisting students complete the steps needed to transfer. It includes advising of or providing information about course transferability; providing students with assistance in the completion of senior college admission applications, financial aids applications; and holding special transfer-related activities such as meetings with senior college recruiters. Part of the procedural aspect also involves establishing inter-institutional articulation agreements for special programs.

The qualitative aspect of transfer education refers to the method used in preparing students to make a smooth transition from the community college environment to that of the senior college. It includes preparing the student to compete effectively in the academic environment of the senior college as well as to function effectively in a different social environment.

Thus, content encompasses both the procedural and qualitative aspects of transfer education. The content of transfer education has been indirectly addressed in the first recommendation made under Organization, where it is suggested that community colleges may need to define the range of services that comprise transfer education. In addition to defining the range of services, community colleges should consider the following possible ways of strengthening the procedural and qualitative aspects of transfer education:

(1) Revising college catalogs to include a section that specifically informs prospective students about: transfer requirements to specified senior colleges, the planning steps needed to prepare for transfer, the types of articulation agreements the college has established with senior colleges, and a statement regarding statewide policies and/or guidelines governing transfer between the public two-year and four-year college sectors. Colleges that are in a position to specify individual course transferability for each receiving senior institution should include the information next to each course listed in the catalog (similar to the format used by the colleges in the Los Angeles Community College district). Additionally the catalog section on transfer education should be easy to locate in the table of contents or in the index.

(2) Students who indicate in their college applications that they want to prepare for transfer should be mailed or given an information packet on transfer opportunities during orientation session.

(3) Counselors and faculty who have the responsibility of advising potential transfer students should have periodic meetings with senior college representatives to be up-to-date on transfer requirements.

(4) Opportunities should be made available for faculty teaching transferable courses to meet with their senior college counterparts in order to have information about course content and requirements. This suggestion is not intended to infer that community college faculty should duplicate senior college courses, but rather that attempts should be made to develop similar skills despite the use of different formats.

(5) Opportunities should be made available to potential transfer students for developing skills essential to succeed in senior colleges. Writing and research skills in particular should be singled out for special attention either within the normal context of course assignments or through special laboratories.

(6) Information on special transfer-related services or activities should be disseminated widely. Additionally, faculty should be consulted about special activities for potential transfer students, and their assistance enlisted in carrying them out.

(7) Training sessions should be held for counselors and faculty to develop their skills in advising potential transfer students, and to use the information they have on students to determine the most appropriate intervention strategies. While faculty are not expected to also be counselors, if they are exposed to strategies of working with students, they may be able to find ways of applying them in the classroom or during formal advisement sessions.

(8) Too often community college students transfer to senior colleges within the same geographic area without realizing that they may have other and better options in colleges that may be further away. Community colleges should make special efforts to expose students to the diversity of institutions, particularly among the smaller private colleges that offer an educational experience that could turn out to be more valuable than that offered by the local public senior college. San Diego City Community College, for instance, uses the Guidance Information System to help students locate institutions that offer programs in their intended major outside the immediate geographic area.

(9) Community and senior colleges should explore possibilities for faculty exchange programs that would give the opportunity to interested faculty to experience a different teaching environment and student body.

## The Future for Transfer

Prior to the 1970s the community colleges maintained policies that had the intent of channeling students in the direction of completing programs. Consider some of the now quaint-sounding rules: entrance tests, course placement, required class attendance, mandatory orientation courses, mid-term grades, penalty drop after the eighth week, academic probation and suspension for students who were not making satisfactory progress, failing grades, and mandatory exit interviews for drop-outs. In the 1970s these were replaced by policies of allowing students to enter any course and to withdraw without penalty up to the last week of the class with no penalty for readmission. The "F" grade and the Incomplete were rarely seen. Grades went up dramatically on average, not because students were doing better but because anyone who was not earning a C or better tended merely to drop the course rather than to get a low grade; hence the lower portion of the grade curve was effectually dropped off.

By the end of the 1970s the students had responded to our allowing them to drop in to any course without bothering about prerequisities by dropping out of any course without consideration of the consequences. The colleges took a lateral form with students attending intermittently. Now, except in the highly structured curriculums of the occupational and technical programs that operate with selective admissions and the other appurtenances of a linear curriculum, the tendency is for people to matriculate in courses willy-nilly. In the Hunter and Sheldon study of students in California community colleges, when students were asked their intentions about course and program enrollment, nearly half responded that they intended to take courses on an intermittent basis, dropping in and out of the institution at will; only a small percent of them said they intended going through the programs in the recommended time period and sequence. The modal course completion pattern among California's 1.3 million community college students was one.

In many college districts, institution record-keeping reflects student course-taking patterns. Many colleges have elaborate computer-based student record files that can print out the number of students enrolled in any section of any course, the faculty-student ratio by type of course, the number of students in each academic program, the number of students receiving various types of financial aids, the number of students enrolled for credit in any division of the college. But without elaborate reprogramming, they cannot tell whether John Jones, who took History I in the fall semester followed by enrolling in History II in the spring term. Their record-keeping is lateral, not linear.

The architecture of community college buildings may too reflect the drop in, drop out pattern of student attendance, with classrooms opening to the parking lots, not to a central quadrangle. One California college opened a U-shaped classroom building in 1979 with the classroom doors opening around the outer perimeter. The center of the portion of the U is well-landscaped and can be viewed through the windows, but students enter and leave the rooms away from the center of the U toward the parking lot.

Linear or lateral? Each model has its proponents, each has its detractors. The lateral model with the students dropping in and out at will, taking the courses they choose fits the predilections of those who would perceive the colleges as community adult learning centers. To them the institutions would be more in the nature of community adult schools or university extension.

The linear model is more to the liking of those who see the community colleges as gate keepers for post-secondary education and as the institutions with prime responsibility for training for specific occupations. Not incidentally, even in California where the lateral mode seems most highly prized, the occupational and technological programs operate in linear form. The program faculty select students, administer admissions tests, design and operate the curriculum, conduct their own student follow-ups, and maintain their own links with lay advisory committees and state licensing boards.

During the next several years, the community colleges will be faced with an acceleration of certain trends, a diminution of others. It is likely that in some states legislative scrutiny will force a separation of credit and non-credit studies with the non-credit courses being put on a pay-as-you-buy basis. Remedial studies will increase in some states as the colleges take over the adult basic education function, decrease in others as high school competency testing programs have the desired effect of returning the lower schools to stricter educational purposes. The community college occupational programs, among their most successful efforts, will increase as occupational upgrading and relicensure become more prevalent in a greater variety of vocations. And the transfer function will be retained because in some rural areas the community college is the only post-secondary institution within reasonable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

commuting distance and because even in cities where senior colleges are available, the community colleges will continue to be used as a place where marginal students may be diverted from the universities' freshmen classes in periods of high enrollment. Probably the most important reason why the transfer function will survive is that without it, the community college loses its image as a college. The administrators and faculty members who have struggled to foster the image of the institution as a true collegiate enterprise would fight to maintain the transfer function if only a handful of students transferred each year.

The intangible but nonetheless powerful forces of tradition and inertia that operate in all institutions will serve to maintain the transfer function. However, it is impossible to predict or even speculate with any degree of accuracy on the magnitude of the transfer portion of the community college curriculum. How shall we count those students who are given transfer credit for prior experience? Will a series of voucher or entitlement plans be enacted so that students wishing to transfer may attend high-utition institutions withou fiscal penalty? Will a new system of funding college operations be adopted that will accomodate all types of students, regardless of whether or not they are enrolled for credit? Will the percent of people participating in any form of post-secondary education increase, decrease, or remain the same? Will the universities compete more vigorously even for the marginally prepared students? How many of the community colleges' prestigous technological programs will become baccalaureate programs?

Whatever the prognosis for transfer education, much attention is now being paid to it. The Ford Foundation's Urban Community

College Transfer Opportunities Program, the projects on behalf of transfer funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the interest in transfer shown by the National Institute of Education and the National Endowment for the Humanities all will serve to keep the idea of transfer in the public eye and in the eyes of the educators. Their long-term effect remains to be seen.

Other efforts are being made, sometimes with support from external agencies, more often using the general resources available to the colleges. Glendale College (Arizona) operates a Minority Engineering Science Achievement program. The Los Angeles District maintains Project Access, an integrated effort to retain potential transfer students. Other colleges have developed special orientation and advising sections for minority students and are constantly changing remedial courses and student support systems. Many of the colleges have once again begun restricting admissions to the transfer courses for underprepared students, feeling that the 1960s philosophy giving the students "the right to fail" was misguided. Some colleges are attempting to create transfer programs from their disparate transfer courses, programs that have support services and readily identifiable procedures built in. Six community colleges at the border with Mexico in California, Arizona, and Texas developed various block programs in which the staff works with students having difficulty in English grammar and writing, reading, psychology, history, and mathematics. Much of the activity involves staff members in designing and implementing practices reaching across the various disciplines in a manner such that students studying in one area are supported by their studies in other areas. (Rendon, 1982).

Miami-Dade Community College has taken the lead in invoking several system changes. It has revised its general education requirements; reinstated a mandatory placement examination; developed several levels of courses in remedial reading, writing, and computation; initiated a Standards of Academic Progress system that monitors students as they progress through the transfer programs; established an Academic Alert and Advisement System designed to flag students with academic difficulties; and installed an Advisement and Graduation Information System that alerts potential transfers as to the requirements of various programs and departments in the different publicly supported senior institutions in Florida. The college also does admissions testing for purposes of placing students in courses where they have a chance of succeeding.

Since beginning these systemic modifications in 1975, the retention and graduation rate of students in Miami-Dade Community College has steadily increased. In 1981-82, the college awarded 7,401 degrees to a student body totaling 36,850, by far the highest number and ratio of graduation among community colleges. And similar graduation rates were shown for white non-Hispanics and for Hispanic students who were equated on entering test scores (Losak and Morris, 1982). Furthermore, the withdrawal rates for Hispanics had become approximately equivalent to the average withdrawal rate for all students.

Much of the literature suggests additional efforts that could be made to enhance transfer rates. Olivas (1979) studied the issue of all minorities in community colleges and concluded that the institutions must promote enhanced academic and academic-support programs in the mainstream collegiate and occupational areas, not in community service and peripheral programs. Avila recommended that all incoming community college freshmen engage in mandatory sessions with counselors, that potential students have their transcripts and credentials evaluated prior to transfer, and that remedial programs targeted for transfer students be established. Chancellor Koltai has spoken out repeatedly on behalf of transfer in the Los Angeles Community College District and has recently exhorted the colleges to make an effort to rebuild the advanced or second year classes so that potential transfer students stay at the community colleges long enough to receive full benefit (1984). Rendon urged the colleges to emphasize the transfer function, provide satellite centers, permit flexible scheduling, and support activities designed to stimulate Hispanic student pride in their institution (1981).

The Commission on Higher Education of Minorities concluded that for the community colleges to enhance transfer, they would have to have better articulation with the universities, stronger remediation and counseling services, and that they should build a transfer college within the community college to more closely approximate the traditional collegiate experience. The Commission recommended also that senior institutions set aside special funds to support community college transfers. In their most controversial recommendation, the Commission suggested that students aspiring to a baccalaureate degree be encouraged to bypass the community colleges and enter the four-year colleges directly (Astin, 1982, p. 191).

Some of these recommendations could be feasibly implemented. The community colleges can build better academic support services;

support special activities for minority students; schedule courses so that minority students take them together, thus enhancing peer group support systems; and provide especially designed transfer counseling. Of itself, none of these practices will solve all problems related to transfer but, as Miami-Dade Community College has shown, a set of practices put together for distinct purpose can have dramatic effect within a span of a few years.

More difficult to effect are the changed practices that involve relationships with senior institutions. Few four-year colleges and universities have made the kind of effort to promote transfer from community colleges that must be made if better transfer rates are to result. Where they have, the results have been positive. Arizona State University and its neighbor, the Maricopa Community College District, have developed numerous links to enhance transfer. By limiting the size of its freshman class and by articulating its upper-division curriculum in severl areas, including business, the university has become a prime receiver of students from the local community colleges; around 40% of its junior class is comprised of tranfer students.

However, where changes in state policy are needed, the modifications are likely to be more difficult to effect. Some states, including Texas, have succeeded in their efforts to require all colleges and universities to use a common course numbering system, a necessary step toward enhancing course articulation and the transfer process. On the other hand, some of the major efforts in state-wide coordination have been less successful. Attempts to have the universities accept associate-degree transfers as having met general education requirements have floundered because of the recalcitrance of the individual departments within the universities whose faculty refuse to accept the general education courses as sufficient preparation to enter their upper-division programs.

One change that could be effected within community colleges is to provide more on-campus jobs for the students. A second change is that greater academic support services be built to assist students in completing their courses satisfactorily. Those two could be married with programs that would employ students tutors and paraprofessional aides to the instructors. The community colleges cannot feasibly recreate the residential experience that students enjoy in institutions where they live on campus, but they can modify their practices in a way that students become more involved.

The colleges could also provide better transfer information to the students. Miami-Dade's Advisement and Graduate Information System allows each student to see at a glance the requirements of the departments in all senior institutions in Florida. The college took the initiative in putting the system together and computerizing it so that students need not depend on counselors to find answers to routine questions regarding the particular courses that a department has agreed to accept. Coupled with computer-generated letters advising students of their academic progress each semester, the system has had a major impact at a relatively modest cost.

In summary, it is easy to disagree with those who say that community college is a dead end for the minorities. The colleges have made it possible for minority students to matriculate in large numbers. It is quixotic to expect that states would have built high-cost senior institutions within easy reach of the majority of the populace. For the minorities, dropout is greater all through the educational system, from the lower schools through the graduate schools. To single out the community colleges as doing a disservice to them is decidedly unfair; the same untoward charge was leveled against elementary schools at the turn of the century when attrition was high for the children of immigrants from Europe to the United States.

Since the mid 1960s, 46 percent of the high school graduates have been entering higher education. In states with well-developed community college systems, rates of college going are high. Where there are few community colleges, fewer people participate in higher education, regardless of the ethnic composition of the state's population. The community college system in California, Texas, Florida, Arizona, and New York have enhanced the rate of college going for all people, especially for the minorities. Would equity be better served if there were no community colleges and consequently if fewer young people from any group entered higher education?

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academy for Educational Development. *An Evaluation of Phase I TOP Projects in 24 Urban Community Colleges*. New York: AED, 1984.

Alba, R.D. and Lavin, D.E. Community Colleges and Teaching in Higher Education. *Sociology of Education*, 1981, *54*, 223-237.

Alexander, K.L. and Cook, M.A. The Motivational Relevance of Educational Plans: Questioning the Conventional Wisdom. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 1979, *42*, pp. 202-213.

American Association for Community and Junior Colleges. *Community, Junior, and Technical Directory*. Washington D.C.: AACJC, 1977 and 1983 editions.

American Council on Education. *1984-85 Fact Book on Higher Education*. New York: Mac Millian Publishing, 1984.

Arizona Commission on Postsecondary Education. *1983-84 Course Equivalency Guide*. Phoenix, Arizona: State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, 1984.

Astin, A.W. *Four Critical Years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977,

Astin, A.W. *Minorities in American Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Astin, A.W. and others. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1983*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1983.

Astin, A.W. and others. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1984*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1984.

Avila, J.G. and others. *Petition to Increase Minority Transfer from Community Colleges to State Four-Year Schools*, Prepared by the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Public Advocates, Inc., and Sacramento Urban League. September 13, 1983.

Bensimon, E.M. and Riley, M.J. *Student Predisposition To Transfer: A Report on Preliminary Findings*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984.

Blow, W.O. Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Associate Director for Academic Affairs, Personal communication, June 29, 1983.

Brawer, F.B. *Trends in the Humanities in Two-Year Colleges*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, June 30, 1984.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics*. Sacramento: CPEC, 1984.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Views from the field*. Sacramento: CPEC, 1984.

Callan, P.M. Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Personal communication, August 15, 1983.

Cameron, K. Organization adaptation and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1984, *55*, pp. 122-144.

Cardinal, J.L. *The influence of some social network characteristics on persisting/nonpersisting transfer students from nine urban community colleges to UCLA*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA, 1981.

City University of New York. *Minutes of Proceedings*, November 27, 1972. CUNY: Board of Higher Education, 1972.

The City University of New York. *Report of the university task force on student retention and academic performance*. New York: CUNY, 1984.

Cohen, A.M. *The Transfer Function in California*. Paper presented to the California Postsecondary Education Commission Ad Hoc Committee - community college transfer, Sacramento, California, June 11, 1984.

Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B. *The American Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982.

Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B. *The Two-Year College Instructor Today*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. *Higher Education Circular*, December 7, 1973. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Education, 1973.

Commonwealth Transfer Compact. *Policy for Facilitating Student Mobility in Massachusetts Higher Education*. Boston, Massachusetts: Board of Regents of Higher Education, 1974.

Commonwealth of Virginia. *Guidelines for promoting articulation between two-year colleges and four-year colleges and universities in Virginia*. Richmond, Virginia: Council of Higher Education, 1967.

Consejo de Educacion Superior. Estadisticas Sobre las Institucionas de Educacion Postsecundaria en Puerto Rico, 1982-83. Puerto Rico: Department of Education, 1983.

Farrell, C.S. "Two-Year Colleges Offer Haven for Many Hispanic Students," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28 (4) March 21, 1984, 1,11.

Friedlander, J. Science Education for Women and Minorities in an Urban Community College: Topical Paper No. 75. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1981.

Hunter, R. and Sheldon, N.S. Statewide Longitudinal Study on Academic Year 1979-80: Part III Fall Results. Woodland Hills, CA: Office of the Chancellor, Los Angeles Pierce College, 1980.

Illinois Community-Senior College Articulation Task Force. Summary of a Report and Recommendations. Illinois: University of Illinois Office of School and College Relations, 1978.

Karabel, J. Community Colleges and social stratification. Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42, 521-561.

University of Kentucky Community College System. State Statute.

Kintzer, F.C. Middleman in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Koltai, L. The state of the district 1981. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges (JC 810 581).

Lombardi, J. The decline of transfer education. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 70, 1979.

Losak, J. and Morris, K. Retention, Graduation and Academic Progress as Related to Basic Skills: Research Report 82-36. Miami, Florida: Office of Institutional Research, Miami-Dade Community College, 1982.

Maryland State Board for Higher Education. Student Transfer Policies. Annapolis, Maryland: State Board for Higher Education, 1979.

Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Offices. The MACRAO Articulation Agreement. (undated).

National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics 1983-84. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

National Center for Education Statistics. Transfer Students in Institutions of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.

National Institute of Education. Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

Office for Civil Rights. Racial Ethnic and Sex Enrollment Data for Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

Office for Civil Rights. Racial, Ethnic, and Sex Enrollment Data for Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1982. (Unpublished data tables).

Ohio Board of Regents. Guidelines on Articulation Between Public Two-Year Campuses and Public Universities. Columbus, Ohio: Board of Regents, 1977.

Olivas, M.A. The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

Pace, C.R. Measuring the Quality of College Student Experiences. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute, 1984.

Parker, P.C. Access and mobility in higher education: the search for a common currency and gold standard. Liberal Education, 1979, 120-134.

Polk, B.B. Program Analyst, University of Hawaii, Office of the Chancellor for Community Colleges, Personal communication, July 5, 1983.

Rendon, L. Basic Skills: Responding to the Task with Effective Innovative Programs. Presentation at Urban Community Colleges in Transition National Policy Conference, Detroit, Michigan, March 7-9, 1982.

Richardson, R.C., Fisk, E.C., and Okun, M.A. Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Riley, M. The Community College General Academic Assessment: Los Angeles District, 1983. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984.

Smith, K.M. Student achievement and open admissions: Do student outcomes fulfill the promise of the open door?. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges (JC 830 173).

Spady, W. Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. Interchange, 1970, 1, 109-121.

Spady, W. Dropouts form higher education: Toward an empirical model. Interchange, 1971, 2, 38-62.

State of Florida. Articulation Agreement (Rule GA-10.24, FAC). Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, 1983.

Texas College and University System. *General Provisions for Transfer or Credit Policies for Public Junior Colleges*. Austin, Texas: Coordinating Board, 1982.

Tinto, V. Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 1975, *45*, 89-125.

Tscheteitin, J.D. Black and white students in Maryland community colleges. In G.E. Thomas (Ed.), *Black Students in Higher Education*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981.

# APPENDIX 1

## Education and General Revenues Raw Amounts for the UCCTOP Collges, 1981-82

| Colleges | E & G Revenues in Raw Amounts |
|---|---|
| Lawson State Community College | $ 5,301,940 |
| Compton Community College | $12,580,842 |
| Los Angeles City College | $29,207,785 |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | $17,640,407 |
| Sacramento City College | $23,492,299 |
| Laney Community College | $16,601,082 |
| Miami-Dade Community College | $85,815,315 |
| U. of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | $ 9,286,073 |
| Community College of Baltimore | $19,025,477 |
| Highland Park Community College | $ 6,241,914 |
| CUNY - Bronx Community College | $29,308,004 |
| Community College of Philadelphia | $27,948,548 |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC | $12,697,795 |
| West Los Angeles College | $15,103,553 |
| CUNY - Hostos Community College | $14,450,117 |
| Cuyahoga Community College District | $47,798,822 |
| San Diego City College | $ 9,945,529 |
| State Community College | $ 4,351,087 |
| CUNY - La Guardia Community College | $26,002,047 |
| Houston Community College | $37,532,796 |
| Roxbury Community College | $ 4,697,130 |
| Los Angeles Mission College | $ 6,823,453 |
| Jefferson Community College | $ 8,276,564 |
| South Mountain Community College | $ 2,972,907 |

Source: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Special Report prepared for the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984.

## APPENDIX 2

### Education and General Revenues and Expenditures per FTE Student in the UCCTOP Colleges, 1981-82

| Colleges | Total E & G Revenues per FTE Student | Total E & G Expenditures per FTE Student |
|---|---|---|
| Lawson State Community College | $5,820 | $6,280 |
| South Mountain Community College | $4,595 | $4,577 |
| Compton Community College | $4,003 | $4,159 |
| Los Angeles City College | $2,504 | $2,883 |
| Los Angeles Harbor College | $2,800 | $3,245 |
| Los Angeles Mission College | $5,189 | $6,282 |
| West Los Angeles College | $3,224 | $3,757 |
| Laney College | $4,116 | $4,110 |
| Sacramento City College | $2,634 | $1,876 |
| San Diego City College | $1,279 | $1,031 |
| Miami-Dade Community College | $3,551 | $3,576 |
| U. of Hawaii - Honolulu CC | $2,538 | $2,498 |
| State Community College | $4,152 | $4,044 |
| Jefferson Community College | $2,028 | $2,022 |
| CC of Baltimore | $4,629 | $4,447 |
| Roxbury Community College | $6,807 | $6,198 |
| Highland Park Community College | $2,740 | $2,812 |
| CUNY - Bronx Community College | $5,406 | $5,386 |
| CUNY - Hostos Community College | $5,183 | $5,153 |
| CUNY - La Guardia CC | $4,138 | $4,120 |
| Cuyahoga Community College District | $3,449 | $3,452 |
| Community College of Philadelphia | $3,433 | $3,179 |
| Houston Community College | $5,422 | $4,914 |
| J. Sargeant Reynolds CC | $2,412 | $2,414 |

Source: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. Special Report prepared for the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 1984.

## APPENDIX 3

### Dominant Strategies Selected by the UCCTOP Colleges to Improve Transfer Opportunities

| | Counseling and Support | Identification and Information | Articulation | Curriculum |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Diego | | * | | |
| Houston | * | | | |
| Los Angeles/City | | | | * |
| Sacramento | * | | | |
| Philadelphia | | | | * |
| Miami-Dade, North | | * | | |
| Cleveland/Cuyahoga | | | * | |
| Oakland/Laney | * | | | |
| Baltimore | | | * | |
| Los Angeles/Harbor | | * | | |
| Los Angeles/West | * | | | |
| New York/La Guardia | | * | | |
| New York/Bronx | | * | | |
| Louisville/Jefferson | * | | | |
| Honolulu | | | * | |
| Los Angeles/Mission | * | | | |
| Compton | | | * | |
| Richmond/Reynolds | * | | | |
| New York/Hostos | | * | | |
| Phoenix/So. Mountain | * | | | |
| East St. Louis/State | | | * | |
| Detroit/Highland Park | | * | | |
| Birmingham/Lawson | | | * | |
| Bostson/Roxbury | | | | * |

Source: Academy for Educational Development. *An Evaluation of Phase I Top Projects in 24 Urban Community Colleges*. New York: AED, 1984.

# APPENDIX 4

## Method Used to Construct Attitudinal and Behavioral Transfer Measures and Measure of Student Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of Transfer Function

Factor analysis, using SPSSX, Version 10 factor program was performed on 24 questionnaire items. All items were measures of some parameter of information on the student, relevant to transfer preparation. Three of these items (TRANSKNOW, COURSETRANS, and TRANSPLANS) were composite scores, collapsed across a number of dichotomous variables.

The Unweighted Least Squares (ULS) procedure was used to derive the initial factor axes, yielding six factors with eigenvalues greater than one. The varimax procedure was then used to induce orthogonality between the measure dimensions.

This rotated factor structure produced three factors with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 29.1% of the total item variance. The three factors, and the total variance accounted for by each were: (1) Transfer Attitude, 15.3%; (2) Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of Transfer Function, 8.1%; and (3) Transfer Behavior, 5.7%.

Homogeneity of Factor Content. Screening of the factors was done at both an intuitive and a statistical level. One item, which indicated the number of four-year colleges or universities a student planned on applying to for transfer, was dropped from the first factor, because of its logical inconsistency with the other items in the factor.

Using SPSSX's Reliability procedure it was found that several variables, particularly two in a composite score, were adversely affecting the internal consistency of the Transfer Behavior factor. These items were subsequently dropped, and the reliabilities recalculated. (Note: this results in an over-estimation of the actual reliability, as it capitalizes on any chance error in the dataset). The final reliabilities for the factors, as well as their individual item loadings are shown in the table below.

Rotated Factor Matrix and Item Loadings

| Item | Transfer Attitude | Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of Transfer Function | Transfer Behavior |
|---|---|---|---|
| TRANSNOTIMP* | -.78 | .03 | -.19 |
| NOWORRY* | -.62 | .06 | .20 |
| JOBIMP* | -.56 | .02 | -.17 |
| TRANSCURNOTPRAC* | -.38 | -.09 | -.17 |
| DISAPPOINT* | .36 | -.02 | .09 |
| COLLAPP[a] | .35 | -.04 | .12 |
| | | | |
| COUNSIMP** | .04 | .78 | .04 |
| TRANSERVICE** | .07 | .70 | .00 |
| QUALINFO** | .00 | .68 | .08 |
| TEACHIMP | -.06 | .27 | .09 |
| ASSOCIATE | .14 | .23 | .01 |
| | | | |
| TRANSKNOW*** | .14 | .05 | .63 |
| COURSETRANS*** | .19 | .07 | .48 |
| TRANSPLANS*** | .18 | -.04 | .43 |
| TRANSINFO*** | .15 | .04 | .38 |
| COURSELIG[b] | .13 | .10 | .37 |
| Reliability Coefficients | .74 | .78 | .79 |

## Rotated Factor Matrix and Item Loadings
## (Footnotes)

[a] Item was dropped from measure despite loading higher than .30 due to inconsistency with other items.

[b] Item dropped due to redundancy with item composition of TRANSKNOW.

* Items used to construct measure of Transfer Attitude.

** Items used to construct measure of Satisfaction with Institutional Performance of Transfer Function.

*** Items used to construct measure of Transfer Behavior.

### Transfer Attitude Measure

In all of the items used in this measure, students were asked to choose one from among five possible choices: strong agreement, agreement, neutral, disagreement, strong disagreement.

TRANSIMP: Transferring to a four-year college is not that important to me.

NOWORRY: Transferring to a four-year college is too far off in the future to worry about it now.

JOBIMP: For me getting a job is more important than transferring to a four-year college.

TRANSCURNOTPRAC: Transfer courses are not very useful because you don't learn any practical skills.

DISAPPOINT: If I don't transfer to a four-year college, I will feel disappointed.

COLLAPP: Students were asked to indicate the number of four-year colleges or universities they planned to apply for transfer.

### Satisfaction with Transfer Function Measure

This measure comprises items representing student satisfaction with institutional performance of the transfer function. Students were asked to choose one from among five possible choices: strong agreement, agreement, neutral, disagreement, strong disagreement.

COURSEIMP: Students who want to transfer get assistance from counselors with applications for admission and financial aid.

TRANSERVICE: Special services are provided for students who want to transfer to four-year colleges.

QUALINFO: This college provides excellent information on transfer opportunities.

TEACHIMP: My teachers have encouraged me to think seriously about transferring to a four-year college.

ASSOCIATE: It is better to transfer to a four-year college after earning the associate degree.

## Transfer Behavior Measure

TRANSKNOW: A composite item made up of three items to which the student was asked to indicate the sources he/she had used to determine transferability of courses taken in the community college. The three possible sources of information were: (1) catalog/course schedule; (2) counselors; (3) by having checked with the four-year college to which they plan on transferring.

COURSETRANS: An item in which students listed the courses they were taking and indicated for each whether they knew if the course was transferable as an elective or toward the major or not eligible for transfer.

TRANSPLANS: A composite of four items in which students indicated: (1) having requested catalog and application form from senior colleges to which they were hoping to transfer; (2) having asked counselor about the colleges' requirements for transfer applicants; (3) visited the colleges; and (4) completed and submitted transfer applications.

TRANSINFO: An item in which students indicated having frequently, occasionally, or rarely sought information on transfer opportunities from counselors.

COURSELIG: An item in which students indicated strong disagreement, disagreement, neutrality, agreement, or strong agreement with the statement: "Every semester or quarter when I register for courses, I first look at the college catalog to determine which courses I need to qualify for transfer." This item was not included in the measure because of redundancy with the item composition of TRANSKNOW.

# APPENDIX 5

## The Center for the Study of Community Colleges

The Center for the Study of Community Colleges was formed in 1974 as a non-profit corporation (501C3) engaged in research and study in education. All Center findings are made readily available to the public through publications, speeches, and conference presentations.

The Center's primary activities are on behalf of educational programs in community colleges nationwide. Center staff members conduct original research studies through surveys and other methodologies, analyze literature pertaining to community colleges, and synthesize research by relating the findings with the existing information regarding community colleges. The Center has conducted studies under grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Education, the Ford Foundation, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. For the past ten years, the Center operating budget has approximated $200,000 per year.

Many of the Center's activities have been addressed towards helping strengthen the liberal arts and transfer education in community colleges. The Center has compiled data regarding curriculum, instructional practices, student support services, and enrollments in liberal arts courses. It has worked with staff in numerous community colleges in efforts to aid them in integrating their own activities that serve to enhance enrollments in liberal arts programs and student transfer from community colleges to senior institutions. The Center has also acted to help strengthen transfer education for minority group students in numerous community colleges across the country and has spoken out at national meetings on behalf of these functions.

Principal Center officers are Arthur M. Cohen, President, and Florence B. Brawer, Secretary-Treasurer. Both have written extensively for higher education practitioners. One of their major recent works is the American Community College, published by Jossey-Bass, Inc. in 1982. Mr. Cohen is also a professor of higher education at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Ms. Brawer is a research affiliate of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges at UCLA.

Over the years the Center has developed a number of data bases:

A national sample of the faculty teaching the humanities and sciences in 175 community colleges in 1975, 1978, and 1983; these data include staff attitudes, values, and instructional practices.

A survey of the faculty teaching the liberal arts in 38 colleges in six large city districts, 1983: attitudes, values, and instructional practices.

A study of student knowledge in the liberal arts (n = 8000) in 38 large city community colleges, 1983-84; humanities, science, social science, mathematics, and English usage as related to demographics.

Student attitudes and behaviors relative to community college transfer education (n = 6200) in the Los Angeles Community College District, 1980.

A study of student concerns and behaviors relative to transfer education in 24 community colleges nationwide, 1984.

Faculty attitudes towards the transfer function ($n = 400$) in 24 colleges nationwide, 1984.

Curriculum patterns in the liberal arts in 175 colleges, 1977-78, 1983-84.

Student enrollments in liberal arts classes in 175 colleges nationwide, 1977-78 and 1983-84.

In addition to these data sets generated in the Center, staff members have assisted in putting together a two volume catalog of all extant data sets regarding community colleges. This volume is on file at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and is updated through 1984.

MAY 3 1985
ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024